

# HIDDEN ISLAM 2020



MAY 1

BROOKLYN PUBLISHERS

Authored by: DR SB CHAUDHARY

---

**COMPILED BY :**

**ABU HISHAM IBN BASHEER AL ALI**

---

# **BIBLICAL ISLAM**

## **WHO CREATED?**

I am providing evidence from Quran that almost all the religious beliefs and practices are fake. Muslims are not obeying their own Quran. That should be sufficient cause to trigger many violent reactions from the religious peoples. Muslims are entrapped in insanity because they do not obey the literal Quran. The Muslims are far removed from their own Quran. They have become frantic mobs and immense failures in life because Muslims have abandoned the Quran. The vast majority of Muslims are actually outside the light of Islam. Almost all these non Quranic practices are plagiarized from the biblical, Jewish, Zoroastrian and other sources. The Old Testament contributes a large part towards the religious beliefs and practices of the mullahs. Most Christians are not even aware that the things they dislike most about Al Qaeda, the Taliban, the jihadist, the new ISIS and the Muslims in general are plagiarized from the Bible. They are biblical teachings. They are most certainly not found in the Quran. Plus, it is well known that most Christians do not follow the Old Testament or even the New Testament to the letter anymore. There is no more killing of heretics (Luke 19:26) or stoning the adulterers to death (Deut 22:21-22). Yet these same practices have been taken from the

---

Bible by the religious people. They are not found in the Quran. They created non Quranic text which they called the hadith (alleged sayings of the prophet), Sunnah (his practices), Ijma (consensus of the religious clergies), Qiyas (analogical reasoning of the sheiks) and other such names. And they cleverly hung all their fabrications on the prophet, for whom the Umayyad also invented a name 'Muhammad'. The Quran says "haatu burhanukum inkuntum saadiqueen" which means 'bring forth your proofs if you are truthful'

Bukhari's collection of hadiths regarded by the Religious people as second only to the Quran as a source of reference for them. There are said to be over 3000 alleged sayings of the prophet in Bukhari's collection (the numbers vary from 2600 to 7200 depending on the Muhadaseen). According to the religious clergies each saying is attributed to a chain of narrators going all the way back to the prophet. However, text of Hadith is never compared to Quran. In about one third of these narrations, the last but one narrator i.e. the one immediately after the prophet is Abu Hurairah. Abu Hurairah was allegedly a companion of the prophet. The mullahs say that Abu Hurairah became a Muslim just three years before the prophet died. Yet Abu Hurairah narrated more sayings from the prophet from this three-year period than any other companion, caliph or wife of the prophet

---

who was with the prophet throughout the 23 years of his mission.

According to Muhammed Zubayr Siddiqui, in his book "Hadith Literature: It's Origin, Development & Special Features" (Islamic Texts Society) Abu Hurairah narrated 5,374 hadith. In comparison, Aisha the prophet's wife narrated 2,210 hadith, Umar the second caliph after the prophet narrated 537 hadith, Ali the fourth caliph narrated 536 hadith whereas Abu Bakr the first caliph narrated 142 hadith. Despite knowing the prophet for only three years, Abu Hurairah has narrated more hadith than all the other four combined. The Religious clergies themselves point out hadith from Abu Hurairah which are contradictory to other hadith. For example, Abu Hurairah narrated the story of a conversation between Ruqayya(r) the wife of Uthman(r) and the prophet(mpuh). He said: "Once I entered the house of Ruqayya(r), the Prophet's daughter and Uthman's wife. She had a comb in her hand. She said: "The Prophet left just a little ago. I

---

combed his hair. He said to me: "How do you find Abu Abdullah (Uthman)?" I said: "He is good." He said to me: "Grace him! He is the most similar to me, among my companions, in morals. Imam al-Hakim, a famous Sunni transmitter of hadith, narrates this and says: "This tradition has a true series of narrators but untrue text, (the content is untrue) because Ruqayya had died in the third year of hijra during the battle of Badar, whereas Abu Hurairah came and became a Muslim after the battle of Khaybar (four years later)." So how did he have this conversation that he claims? Another such contradiction pointed out by the Mohadseen is when Abu Hurairah boasted "We conquered Khaybar but we didn't gain gold or silver. We gained sheep, cows, camels, wares and houses." Abu Hurairah never participated in the Battle of Khaybar. He became a Muslim after that battle. To answer the charge that Abu Hurairah has narrated far too many hadith, the mullahs quote the story that Abu Hurairah would hang around the prophet's home hoping for a meal and to learn hadith. The person who has been begging for meal ( no ego) how come he can teach the message of human prestige.

"When I was distressed with severe hunger, I would go to a companion of the Prophet and asked him about an ayah of the

---

Qur'an and (stay with him) learning it so that he would take me with him to his house and give food. One day, my hunger became so severe that I PLACED A STONE ON MY STOMACH. I then sat down in the path of the companions. Abu Bakr passed by and I asked him about an ayah of the Book of God. I only asked him so that he would invite me but he didn't. Then Umar ibn al-Khattab passed by me and I asked him about an ayah but he also did not invite me. Then the Messenger of Allah passed by and realized that I was hungry and said: Abu Hurairah! "At your command" I replied and followed him until we entered his house. He found a bowl of milk and asked his family: "From where did you get this?" "Someone sent it to you" they replied. He then said to me: "O Abu Hurairah, go to the Ahl as-Suffah and invite them." Abu Hurairah did as he was told and they all drank from the milk." (Bukhari 65: 343 etc). The practice of placing a stone upon one's stomach to alleviate hunger has never been heard of from before or after Abu Hurairah. This illogical story is obviously fake. This narrative says that Abu Hurairah would hang around the prophet's home waiting for some nourishment both for his stomach and his curiosity. However, hanging around the prophet's house waiting for 'hadith' or even hoping for a meal has earned a direct rebuke from the prophet in the Quran:33:53:

O believers! Do not enter the houses of the Holy Prophet



---

(blessings and peace be upon him) unless permission is granted to you for a meal. Nor (reach so early as to) wait for the cooking of the meal. But when you are invited, then enter (at that time). Then, when you have eaten the meal, (get up from there and) disperse without delay, and do not linger on in eagerness for talk/Hadith. Surely, your (sitting for long in this) manner discomforts the Holy Prophet (blessings and peace be upon him); and he feels reluctant to (ask) you (to leave), but Allah does not hesitate in (saying) the truth. And when you ask them (the pure wives) for something, ask them from behind a curtain. This (regard and nice manner) causes great purity for your hearts and for their hearts. And it is not (at all lawful) for you that you cause inconvenience to the Holy Messenger of Allah (blessings and peace be upon him), nor is this (lawful) that you marry his (pure) wives after him, till the end of time. Surely, it is the most grievous sin in the sight of Allah.

The Quran (and hence the prophet) directly rebukes anyone who persists in entering the prophet's home for a meal or a hadith. Yet the mullahs extoll this same breach by Abu Hurairah as his virtue. Other than debunking themselves it is certainly a deliberate sabotage of Islam by the Religious clergies. The mullahs have attributed even more ridiculous stories to Abu Hurairah. The following are found in the 'most



---

authentic' collection of Bukhari : Narrated Abu Hurairah : Moses put his clothes on a rock to swim in the sea away from people. The rock ran away with Moses' cloths in order to force him to follow naked in front of the Israelites in order to refute the rumor that Moses had a hernia. Moses ran after the rock shouting: "O, rock, my clothes. O rock, my clothes." The rock stopped after ending its task. Moses began beating the rock with his stick so severely until he made some scars in the rock. (Sahih Bukhari, Volume 1, Book 5, Number 277).

Unfortunately, Muslims of 21<sup>st</sup> century believe this cocked story as a miracle of Moses.

**Narrated Abu Huraire :** The Prophet said, "While a man was riding a cow, it turned towards him and said, 'I have not been created for this purpose (i.e. carrying), I have been created for sloughing.'" The Prophet added, "I, Abu Bakr and 'Umar believe in the story." The Prophet went on, "A wolf caught a sheep, and when the shepherd chased it, the wolf said, 'Who will be its guard on the day of wild beasts, when there will be no shepherd for it except me?' "After narrating it, the Prophet said, "I, Abu Bakr and 'Umar too believe it." Abu Salama (a sub-narrator) said, "Abu Bakr and 'Umar were not present then." Bukhari, Volume 3, Book 39, Number 517.

---

*Other than rocks which became alive, cows and wolves could speak like humans.*

"Narrated Abu Huraira: I said, 'O Allah's Apostle! I hear many narrations from you but I forget them.' He said, 'Spread your covering sheet.' I spread my sheet and he moved both his hands as if scooping something and emptied them in the sheet and said, 'Wrap it.' I wrapped it round my body, and since then I have never forgotten a single Hadith."

*The prophet of Islam becomes a magician performing magic tricks to enhance Abu Hurairah's memory. Here are some other well known hadith narrated by Abu Hurairah which have made their way into Bukhari's authentic collection*

Narrated Abu Hurairah : The Angel of Death used to come to people visibly, but when he came to Prophet Moses to take his life, Moses slapped him, gouged his eye, and sent him back to God one-eyed. After this accident, the angel of death went to people invisibly! (Sahih of al-Bukhari, vol. 2, p.p. 163 and vol. 1, p.p. 158).

Narrated Abu Hurairah: Allah's Apostle said, "When the Adhan (muezzin's call to prayer) is pronounced Satan takes to his heels and passes wind noisily during his flight in order not to hear the Adhan(azaan). When the Adhan is completed he comes back and again takes to his heels when the Iqama

---

is pronounced and after its completion he returns again till he whispers into the heart of the person (to divert his attention from his prayer) and makes him remember things which he does not recall to his mind before the prayer and that causes him to forget how much he has prayed." (Sahih Bukhari, Volume 1, Book 11, Number 582).

Another narration by Abu Hurairah, this time about Prophet Solomon who said: "I will go to bed with a hundred women tonight that every one of them will give birth to a boy, who will fight for the sake of Allah." The angel asked him to say inshallah. He did not say. So no one of his wives gave birth to a baby save one, who gave birth to half a human being!-----

----- This mullah story of Solomon bedding hundreds of women is based on the following biblical narrative: King Solomon loved, in addition to the daughter of Pharaoh, many foreign woman, Moabite, Ammonite, Edomite, Sidonian and Hittite women, from the nations concerning which the Lord had warned the Israelites. "You must not share with them, nor they with you, for they will certainly turn your hearts to their gods". Solomon held fast to them in love. He had 700 official wives and 300 concubines(loundi,maids)....(1 Kings 11:1-3).

---

These are just some examples of strange narrations attributed to Abu Hurairah that can be found in the authentic collection of Bukhari. However the biggest mystery about Abu Hurairah is that no one knows his real identity. Abu Hurairah is a nickname which means ***Father of Cats***. There is no consensus about his real identity. Various names have been suggested including Abdel Rahman, Abdel Shams, Abdel Rahman Ad Daws, Abd al-Rahman ibn Sakhr Al-Azdi and others. He is said to be from the clan of al Daws. Other versions say the clan of Dan Qadum. These names are based on the consensus (ijma) of some sunni clerics. Who exactly are these sunni Mohadseen and when this consensus was achieved or where it was recorded is not known. Yet the fake name 'Father of Cats' has stuck. A large part of hadith found in the 'authentic' Bukhari collection is therefore attributed to a mysterious figure Abu Hurairah whose real identity cannot be authenticated. Yet the Sunni Muslims have no problems believing in ridiculous fables narrated by an anonymous character.

Muslims have never been pushed to understand Quran, because Quran is not specific message to group of people calling themselves Muslims, it is al-Kitab that is Guidance to

---

Mutaqeen. , Questions arises who are the righteous people ,  
Quran defines them as

2:177:

**1-**Righteousness is not merely that you turn your faces to the east or the west.

This clearly indicates Islam has no worship to face either side ,

**2-**But true righteousness is that a person believes in Allah,  
To believe in ALLAH means to follow Quranic commands, otherwise every religion has its own God to believe.

**3-**the Last Day

Here the last day means the time of results a person performs an acts in his life that is continue process.

**4-** the angels,

Religious people created a mysterious phenomenon about superstitious creature, in Quranic language these are those people who implement the laws laid down in Quran(nafzeen e ehkamat) originally this concept created by Zoroastrians.

---

**5-the Book**

**6-the Messengers**

**7-Driven by love for Allah**

Driven by love for Allah means to follow and obey the orders of Quran

**8-he spends (his) wealth on the kindred, the orphans, the needy,**

To spend wealth is basic factor in Islam and in meaningful way and wealth should be achieved in appropriate way without human torture and disrespect.

**9-the wayfarers and those who ask and in (liberating slaves') necks,**

In present time those prisoners who are unable to pay their imposed fines by courts in minor crimes.

**10-and establishes Salat and pays Zakat**

The word Salat has vast meanings , unfortunately it has been specified for worship, in quranic literature it means laws of Quran that are authorized to implement to purify(zaka) the soul.

---

**11-** And when they make a promise, they fulfil it and are steadfast in hardship and sufferings

Islam insists to full fil his/her sayings , in the world there are different sorts of hardships that may detract a person but Human must face them with courage and in promising way.

**12-** and at the time of fierce fighting (i.e., jihad against illiteracy, terrorists etc.). It is these who are truthful and it is these who are righteous.

The above 12 instructions are defined for those people to whom Quran provides guidance.

If these instruction are followed in true spirit by any nation irrespective of their belief that society will become the most honest and truth for themselves and for others , all other nations will come to stay with them and pass their lives with them.



---

## WHO WAS THE FIRST MUSLIM.

As I mentioned before interpretation of Quran was done keeping in front the bible and other religious book , or something else that has not been disclosed how the quran came into being.

The discrepancies created by interpreters or who formatted the AL- Kitab are many that we will discuss few of them , the most valued is , “who is first Muslim?” Quran mentioned for many prophets claiming that they were the first Muslims, but question remains there, then who was the first?

According to several passages in the Quran, Muhammad(mpuh) was the first Muslim:

14.6: Say: ‘Shall I take (for worship) anyone as (my) friend other than Allah, Who is the Creator of the heavens and the earth, and He feeds (all) and is not fed (Himself)?’ Say: ‘**I have been commanded to become the first Muslim** (who bows his head before His Holy presence), and (this too has been commanded) never to be one of the polytheists.’

6:161: Say: ‘Verily, my Lord has guided me to the straight path. (This is the path of) the well-founded Din (Religion), the path followed by Ibrahim (Abraham) single-mindedly devoted to Allah, turning aside from every falsehood. And he was not of the

---

polytheists.

6:163:He has no partner and of this have I been commanded, *and I am the first Muslim (in the entire creation).*

39:11-12:Say (O Muhammad): Lo! I am commanded to worship Allah,making religion pure for Him (only). And I am commanded to be the first of those who are muslims (surrender unto Him).

This is contradicted by both the Quran and various Islamic traditions which refer to the presence of true believers both before and during Muhammad's alleged "call" to prophethood. The Quran mentions that Adam, Noah, the Patriarchs, the twelve tribes of Israel, Moses, Jesus etc., were all believers and many of them even messengers who lived a long time before Muhammad:

2:30:And (recall) when your Lord said to the angels: 'I am about to place My vicegerent on the earth.' They submitted: 'Will You put (the vicegerent) on the earth such as will do mischief in it and shed blood, whilst we are engaged in glorifying You with

celebrating Your Praise and extolling Your Holiness (all the time)?' (Allah) said: 'I know that which you do not know.'

---

2:34:And (also recall) when We commanded the angels: ‘Prostrate yourselves before Adam.’ Then they all prostrated themselves to Adam except Iblis . He refused and showed arrogance, and (consequently) became one of the disbelievers.

(Here it is necessary to mention that Allah ordered angles to prostrate whereas Iblis is not among angles but belongs species of jins who are made of fire, so this order does not apply on him , therefore he did not prostrate.)

2:35:And We ordained: ‘O Adam, reside you and your wife in this Paradise and eat of it, both of you, whatever you like and from wherever you will. But do not go near this tree lest you should (join) the transgressors.’

2:37:Then Adam learnt some words from his Lord. So Allah accepted his repentance. Surely, He is the One Who is Most Relenting, Ever-Merciful. (O Beloved!).

4:163:Indeed, We have sent Revelation to you as We sent it to Nuh (Noah) and (other) Messengers after him; and We also sent Revelation to Ibrahim (Abraham), Isma’il (Ishmael), Ishaq (Isaac), Ya’qub (Jacob) and (his) children, and ‘Isa (Jesus), Ayyub (Job),

---

Yunus (Jonah), Harun (Aaron) and Sulayman (Solomon); and We conferred the Zabur (the Book of Psalms) upon Dawud (David).

6:84:And We bestowed upon him (Ibrahim [Abraham]) Ishaq(Isaac) and Ya'qub (Jacob—son and grandson) and blessed all (of them) with guidance. (Also) before (them), We provided guidance to Nuh (Noah) and (guided aright) amongst his progeny

Dawud (David), Sulayman (Solomon) and Ayyub (Job) and Yusuf (Joseph) and Musa (Moses) and Harun (Aaron). And thus do We reward the pious.

2:127-133: And when Ibrahim and Ismail raised the foundations of the House: Our Lord! accept from us; surely Thou art the Hearing, the Knowing: Our Lord! and make us both submissive (muslimayni) to Thee and (raise) from our offspring a nation submitting (ommatan muslimatan) to Thee, and show us our ways of devotion and turn to us (mercifully), surely Thou art the Oft-returning (to mercy), the Merciful. Our Lord! and raise up in them an Apostle from among them who shall recite to them Thy communications and teach them the Book and the wisdom, and purify them; surely Thou art the Mighty, the Wise. And who forsakes the religion of Ibrahim but he who makes himself a fool, and

---

most certainly We chose him in this world, and in the hereafter he is most surely among the righteous. When his Lord said to him, Be a Muslim (aslim), he said: I submit myself (aslamtu) to

the Lord of the worlds. And the same did Ibrahim enjoin on his sons and (so did) Yaqoub. O my sons! surely Allah has chosen for you (this) faith, therefore die not unless you are Muslims (illa waantum muslimoona). Nay! were you witnesses when death visited Yaqoub, when he said to his sons: What will you serve after me? They said: We will serve your God and the God of your fathers, Ibrahim and Ismail and Ishaq, one God only, and to Him do we submit (wanahnu lahu muslimoona).

3:52:When Jesus found Unbelief on their part He said: "Who will be My helpers to (the work of) Allah?" Said the disciples: "We are Allah's helpers: We believe in Allah, and do thou bear witness that we are Muslims.

3:67:Ibrahim was not a Jew nor a Christian but he was (an) upright (man), a Muslim (musliman), and he was not one of the polytheists.

3:113-115:They are not all alike; of the followers of the Book there is an upright party; they recite Allah's communications in the nighttime and they adore (Him). They believe in Allah

---

and the last day, and they enjoin what is right and forbid the wrong and they strive with one another in hastening to good deeds, and those are among the good. And whatever good they do, they shall not be denied it, and Allah knows those who guard (against evil).

5:110-111:Then will Allah say: "O Jesus the son of Mary! Recount My favour to thee and to thy mother. Behold! I strengthened thee with the holy spirit, so that thou didst speak to the people in childhood and in maturity. Behold! I taught thee the Book and Wisdom, the Law and the Gospel and behold! thou make out of clay, as it were, the figure of a bird, by My leave, and thou breathest into it and it become a bird by My

leave, and thou heal those born blind, and the lepers, by My leave. And behold! thou bring forth the dead by My leave. And behold! I did restrain the Children of Israel from (violence to) thee when thou didst show them the clear Signs, and the unbelievers among them said: 'This is nothing but evident magic.' And behold! I inspired the disciples to have faith in Me and Mine Messenger: they said, 'We have faith, and do thou bear witness that we bow to Allah as Muslims.

---

27:30-31 Lo! it is from Solomon, and lo! it is: In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful; Exalt not yourselves against me, but come unto me as those who surrender (muslimeena). ... So, when she came, it was said (unto her): Is thy throne like this? She said: (It is) as though it were the very one. And (Solomon said): We were given the knowledge before her and we had surrendered (wakunna muslimena) (to Allah). ...

27:42,44: It was said unto her: Enter the hall. And when she saw it she deemed it a pool and bared her legs. (Solomon) said: Lo! it is a hall, made smooth, of glass. She said: My Lord! Lo! I have wronged myself, and I surrender (aslamtu) with Solomon unto Allah, the Lord of the Worlds.

Apart from various groups being called guided, having the right faith, or even having been given inspiration, we have at least Abraham and the disciples of Jesus being explicitly called Muslims (3:52, 67, 5:111). Certainly both Abraham and the disciples of Jesus lived long before Muhammad. In fact, the Quran claims that all believers were essentially Muslims:

22:78: And strive hard in the way of Allah (for the elimination of oppression, and the establishment of peace and human dignity,) such a striving as is due to Him. He has



---

chosen you, and has not laid upon you any hardship or constriction (in the matter of) Din (Religion). This is the Din (Religion) of your father Ibrahim (Abraham). He (Allah) has named you Muslims in the previous (Books) as well as in this (Holy Qur'an) so that this (final) Messenger may be a witness over you and you be witnesses over mankind. So, (to sustain this status) establish the Prayer, pay Zakat (the Alms-due, i.e., mandatory charity) and hold fast to (the embrace of) Allah. He (alone) is your Helper (i.e., Patron). So what an excellent Patron and what an excellent Helper is He!

**CONCLUSION: Would that not qualify them as being Muslims and believers even before Muhammad? Certainly, this would make Adam the first believer, the first Muslim, wouldn't it?**

Once it is decided in Quran that first Muslim is Adam and all messengers till Muhammad , then there is no role left to follow khatam al nabbayian a criteria to have a belief.

## **WHY WE PROFESS OUR RELIGIONS?**

We do not have much choice. That is the short answer. Why are we christians, hindus, buddhists, sunnis, shiahs or jewish? The answer for the vast majority of us is because we

---

were born into families that were already professing one of these religions. It is as simple as that. Few of us question what our parents and grandparents taught us. We just follow our parents. Hindus put ash on their foreheads and pray to stone carvings which they believe represents their gods. They do this because their parents taught them so. A stone carving of a human shape with an elephant's head for example is representative of a hindu god. Others like the sunnis and shiahs may find such beliefs illogical. Why? Because they were born into families where parents teach their children to pray toward a stone building in Mecca which they call the Kaaba. The sunnis and shiahs also kiss a black stone that is embedded into one corner of the Kaaba. To the sunni and shiah the hindu representation of god in the form of a stone that looks like a human and elephant hybrid is not acceptable. To them praying towards a stone structure but in the shape of a cube is more logical. Then comes the Christian who feels that the Sunni, shiah and Hindu prayers facing stone structures are all illogical because he has been taught by his parents that a Christian prays towards a cross which may be made of stone or wood. Or he may even pray towards a stone carving of a human form of Jesus or his mother Mary. To the Christian this is more

---

logical. Then comes the Jew who says his ultimate holy of holies is a stone wall in Jerusalem. His parents have taught him to nod his head and rock his body to and fro in a wailing motion in front of his Wailing Wall. Praying facing a stone wall makes better sense to the Jew rather than praying facing a cross, a stone building or a stone carving of a man-elephant hybrid. Each person who is born into a Sunni, Shiah, Hindu, Christian or Jewish household will defend his religion to the hilt simply because he was born into the religion. There are converts of course who convert out of choice but once converted their descendants are automatically born into the adopted religion of their fathers. We believe and uphold our religions so much because we inherit our religions from our parents. What does the Quran say about inheriting religion from our parents?

***2:170 And when it is said to them, Follow what Allah has revealed, they say: Nay! We follow what we found our fathers upon. What! And though their 17 fathers had no sense at all, nor did they follow the right way.***

***7:28 And when they commit an indecency they say: We found our fathers doing this, and Allah has enjoined it on us. Say: Surely Allah does not enjoin indecency; do you say against Allah what you do not know?***

---

***7:173 “Or you should say: Only our fathers associated others (with Allah) before, and we were an offspring after them: Wilt Thou then destroy us for what the vain doers did?”***

People will blame their parents, heritage, culture and their traditions. But the Quran holds us responsible for our own beliefs - not what our fathers believed because what if our fathers had no sense at all? How do we answer to that? Surely we must exercise our own free will and exercise our own good judgement instead of just blaming it on our fathers. The human wants something tangible to worship - a stone carving, a stone building, a cross or a stone wall. Something to make it easy for him to focus on his deity.

Every generation improves its concepts about deity and play a blame game against their for-fathers, in next few hundred years the people will be very much different in worship or they will not worship at all and then would quote theses verses, The human being will not give up what he/she inherited from his/her fathers. Hence the Sunnis and Shiah will refuse to obey the Quran because the Quranic teachings are alien to what their fathers taught them. They will reject the clear teachings of the Quran which refute mullah beliefs that are plagiarized from the Bible. Out of sheer force of

---

habit and fear of leaving their comfort zone the Sunni and Shiah will choose to prolong the falsehoods the mullah taught their fathers. They don't want to find out what is written in the Quran. They will continue to uphold biblical teachings.

## **AQEEDAH" AND PUNISHMENTS OF DEATH**

"Al-aqeedah according to the scholars of Islam is the firm creed that one's heart is fixed upon without any wavering or doubt. It excludes any supposition, doubt or suspicion.

Religious peoples are always concerned that 'Aqedah' can be deviated or crooked, especially if it is the 'Aqedah' of their neighbors. They always like to judge their neighbors. In the never ending struggle between the Shiah and the Sunnis, they both say that although they may have some outward similarities, their Aqedah differs in that the core of their creed remains different. This gives them justification to kill each other. The truth is that the Quran does not mention anything about 'aqeedah' or that it refers to religious faith, belief or a creed. The Quran only refers to trust or 'iman'

There are occurrences of derivatives like 'uqdah' referring to 'the knot of marriage' (2:235) or 'aqada' referring to

---

upholding the proper sharing of inheritances (4:33) but there is no such word as 'aqeedah' in the Quran referring to a creed or faith. The word 'aqeedah' comes from the Bible, in this case the Hebrew language Bible. The Oxford Companion to the Bible talks about 'aqeedah'. Aqeedah: the Hebrew word for 'binding', and the common designation for Genesis 22:1-19 in which God tests Abraham by commanding that he sacrifice his son Isaac. Abraham "binds" Isaac" (verse 9). The New Testament refers to the Aqedah not as an example of a delivering sacrificial death but rather as an example of "FAITH".

In Bible there is -----**[Heb 11:17] By FAITH Abraham, when he was tested, offered up Isaac, and he who had received the promises was ready to offer up his only son. [Rom 4:16] That is why it depends on FAITH, in order that the promise may rest on grace and be guaranteed to all his descendants--not only to the adherents of the law but also to those who share the faith of Abraham, for he is the father of us all**

The prophet is said to have existed around the seventh century AD. that there is no proper noun 'Muhammad' mentioned in those five verses in the Quran which the religious people say refer to 'Muhammad'. Neither is there

---

any historical evidence that the prophet's name was 'Muhammad',,,,,,

The Sunnis did not come into existence until about the ninth century AD. This means the Hebrew Bible had a nine-hundred-year head start talking about 'Aqedah'. This is evidence enough that the Muslim's concept of Aqedah as a "religious creed" has been plagiarized from the Bible

## HUDOOD

The Muslim's sharia laws also include the "hudood" penal code including the crime of apostasy which is punishable by death. In the Quran there is absolutely no punishment for apostasy. The Koran states that a person can jump into and out of belief without suffering any molestation. Here is the verse that proves it:

***4:137 'Surely those who believe then disbelieve, again believe and again disbelieve, then increase in disbelief, Allah will not forgive them nor guide them in the right path'.***

This murderous belief is taken from the Bible and then passed off as the teachings of the prophet. Here is the Bible:



---

Leviticus 24:16 - “Moreover, the one who blasphemes the name of the LORD shall surely be put to death; all the congregation shall certainly stone him. The alien as well as the native, when he blasphemes the Name, shall be put to death.” Luke 19:27 - But those enemies of mine who did not want me to be king over them—bring them here and kill them in front of me. Deuteronomy 13:5 - That prophet or dreamer must be put to death for inciting rebellion against the Lord your God, who brought you out of Egypt and redeemed you from the land of slavery. That prophet or dreamer tried to turn you from the way the Lord your God commanded you to follow. You must purge the evil from among you.

Deuteronomy 13:6-10 - If your very own brother, or your son or daughter, or the wife you love, or your closest friend secretly entices you, saying, “Let us go and worship other gods” (gods that neither you nor your ancestors have known, 7 gods of the peoples around you, whether near or far, from one end of the land to the other), 8 do not yield to them or listen to them. Show them no pity. Do not spare them or shield them. 9 You must certainly put them to death. Your hand must be the first in putting them to death, and then the hands of all the people. 10 Stone them to

---

death, because they tried to turn you away from the Lord your God, who brought you out of Egypt, out of the land of slavery.

The Bible says those who blaspheme the name of the Lord, those who are ‘dreamers of dreams’, those who tell you to serve other gods must all be put to death. This is what the mullahs say as well. And the mullahs shall have the final say in deciding what exactly is blasphemy, who exactly is a dreamer of dreams or what exactly is ‘enticing you.’ If they say you are outside their ‘aqeedah’ you can be labeled an apostate and then killed. This is not the teaching of Islam. The prophet himself taught us :

**4:137 Surely those who believe then disbelieve, again believe and again disbelieve, then increase in disbelief, Allah will not forgive them nor guide them in the (right) path.**

## **BUKHARI DID NOT WRITE THE SAHIH BUKHARI**

25:30 And the Messenger will say: O my Lord! surely my people have abandoned the Quran.

The everyday ‘Islam’ that struts on the world stage with its suicide bombings, its decapitations, its shariah laws, stoning women to death, kidnapping school girls, outlawing the

---

reading of books, burning down churches and now blowing up mosques as well is based on these hadith collections of the mullahs.

The mullahs say that without their hadith collections they cannot even understand the Quran. This belief is in direct contradiction with the Quran which says that the Quran has been made easy for our remembrance.

54:17 And certainly We have made the Koran easy for remembrance, but is there anyone who will TAKE HEED ?

This is exactly what the Religious people have done. They have totally abandoned the Quran. So what do the clergies depend on? They will fall back almost entirely on their false hadith and other non Quranic sources. The Sunni mullahs say endlessly that in their pantheon of hadith, the writings of Bukhari' are second only to the Quran' as the source of their 'religion'.

The mullahs say that without their hadith collections they cannot even understand the Quran. This belief is in direct contradiction with the Quran which says that the Quran has been made easy for our remembrance.

54:17 And certainly We have made the Koran easy for remembrance, but is there anyone who will TAKE HEED?

Obviously for emphasis the Quran repeats this particular verse three more times in 54:22, 54:32 and 54:40. It is

---

simple logic that to enable people to take heed of the Quran, the book must be easy to remember. Hence the multiple assurances. A Book of Guidance has to be user friendly. The mullahs say that the magnum opus of their hadith collections is the work of Bukhari - a Persian who was born and raised in Bokhara in Central Asia. His collection, widely known as the Sahih Bukhari is touted by the mullahs as the second most important source of reference in Islam after the Quran.

According to our clergies and Historians Bukhari is believed to have died in 870 AD which is 238 years after the prophet. This means Bukhari never met the prophet, the companions of the prophet, the generation succeeding the prophet (tabiin) or even the generation after them (tabii tabiin). Bukhari's writings of what he thought were the sayings of the prophet were therefore entirely hearsay.

The mullahs themselves do not read the collection known as Sahih Bukhari from cover to cover. If they do so they would realise that the Sahih Bukhari tries to explain only one third or less of the 6,348 verses in the Koran. There are not enough Bukhari hadith to explain the entire Koran.

And they will also come across the following words "No hadith were recorded here" as Bukhari's 'explanation' for 28 surahs or chapters of the Koran. (See SahihBukhari, Volume 6 -Tafsir of the Koran, translation by Dr Muhammad Muhsin

---

Khan, University Medina Al Munawwara).

Bukhari himself admits that he has no hadith to explain 28 complete surahs or chapters of the Quran. That is 25 percent of the 114 surah's. And the remaining hadith are sketchy and do not throw any new light on any of the verses of the Quran at all. Yet the clergies say the collection of Bukhari hadith is 'second only to the Quran'. Here is a description of Bukhari by an admirer:

"If the rich literature of Hadith is assumed a splendid collection of pearls, Al-Jami'us-Sahih of Imam al-Bukhari is rightfully privileged to be called a gigantic ocean serenely flowing for the providence and safeguard of those precious pieces of magnificence. A vast, yet shoreless ocean having lavishly quenched the thirst of many, it is unanimously held in the high esteem of being 'the most authentic book after the book of God' by advocates and adversaries alike'.

They speak with pride about "the dazzling level of measures" adopted by Bukhari in preserving the credibility of his chain of narrators or sanad.

Despite all these comments there is no evidence that Bukhari even wrote the so called 'Sahih Bukhari'. The mullahs themselves say that "Bukhari's text has not come down to us in a single uniform version, but exists in several 'narrations' (riwayat), of which the version handed down by al-Kushaymani (d. 968 AD) on the authority of Bukhari's

---

pupil al-Firabri is the one most frequently accepted by the scholars".

They do not have a complete record of hadith which they can say with certainty was written by the hands of Bukhari. There is no such thing. What they have are bits and pieces that have been sorted and put together over a period of almost 600 years. The mullahs realize that they are running on empty. To lend credence to their adulation of Bukhari the clergies say that up to 70 commentaries have been written on Bukhari's 'great Sahih'.

According to them the most celebrated of these commentaries is "without question the Fath al-Bari('Victory of the Creator') by Imam Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalani, a work which was the crown both of its genre and of the Imam's academic career. It is appreciated by the scholars for the doctrinal soundness of its author, for its complete coverage of Bukhari's material, its mastery of the relevant Arabic sciences, the wisdom it shows in drawing lessons (fawa'id) from the hadith it expounds, and its skill in resolving complex disputes over variant readings. For Bukhari's text has not come down to us in a single uniform version, but exists in several 'narrations' (riwayat), of which the version handed down by al-Kushaymani on the authority of Bukhari's pupil al-Firabri is the one most frequently accepted by the scholars" - (See "Fath al-Bari: Commentary on Sahih al-Bukhari" by Shaykh Abdal Hakim Murad,

---

<http://www.sunnah.org>).

By their own admission their collection of Bukhari hadith is compiled from a 'commentary' by Ibu Hajar Asqalani. IbnuHajar Asqalani died in 1466 AD which is 596 years after Bukhari (d. 870 AD). The mullahs say Bukhari never wrote down a complete book. There were no printing presses or photocopy machines or computers available at that time. The Sahih Bukhari was never extant as a complete work. And 596 years separated Ibnu Hajar from Bukhari. So how did Ibnu Hajar write a commentary about a book that was never extant?

To overcome the gap the mullahs say Ibnu Hajar Asqalani based his writing on the commentary of al-Khushaymani who died in 968 AD. Thus they narrow the gap to 498 years between Ibnu Hajar Asqalani and the commentary of al Khushaymani. However even the commentary of al Khushaymani did not exist in one complete collection. And Khushaymani is still separated from Bukhari by 133 years. To fill this gap the mullahs call upon al Firabri (Muhammad ibn Yusuf ibn Matar al Firabri d. 899AD) who they say was the missing link and source of the collection of hadith from Bukhari (d. 870 AD) to Khushaymani (d. 968 AD) to IbnuHajarAskalani (d. 1466 AD).

The reader must bear in mind that throughout this passage of 596 years between Bukhari and Ibnu Hajar, their own



---

evidence admits that there never was any completely written down collection of Bukhari hadith.

The claim that Ibnu Hajar Asqalani wrote his commentary of Bukhari based on Kushaymani is subject to much guesswork. 463 years separated them with no copiers, printed books or proper records to bridge the huge gaps in time. The same argument goes for the 70 other commentators. The number 70 is itself mind boggling. Each of the 70 will have his own sources, complete with their own versions and interpretations. This guesswork forms the basis of their religion.

Here is a typical example of the Islamic historian language : “Ibn Hajar frequently uses the Kushaymani variant as his standard text, but gives his reasons, often in complex detail, for preferring other readings where these seem to have particular merit. In doing this he makes it clear that he is authorised, through the ijaza-system, for all the riwayat he cites”.

This is a round about way of saying that Ibnu Hajar Asqalani merely patched together his idea of what he thought the Sahih Bukhari should be. This is because there were variances in the available sources. So this is what they call the Sahih Bukhari. And the mullahs say "there are few hadith which can be understood adequately without reference to the often complex debates which have taken place

---

concerning them between the scholars". So first they say that the hadith explains the Koran. Then they say that without the mullahs complex debates you cannot even understand the hadith.

Muslims will now have to depend on the complex debates between the mullahs before they can understand the mullahs hadith, only after which the Muslims can understand the Koran. Despite so much bravado, the Bukhari hadith still says 'No hadith were recorded here' for 28 surahs of the Quran.

The proof of the pudding is in the eating. Here is an example from Bukhari's pieces of magnificence, followed by IbnuHajar's explanation of the same in greater detail.

Bukhari Volume 5, Book 58, Number 188: Narrated 'Amr bin Maimun- During the pre-Islamic period of ignorance I saw a she-monkey surrounded by a number of monkeys. They were all stoning it, because it had committed illegal sexual intercourse. I too, stoned it along with them.

Ibnu Hajar Asqalânî gives a more detailed narration of this event from Amir b. Maymoon: "I was in Yemen tending the sheep of my people up upon an elevation. A male monkey came with a female and laid his head on her hand. Then a smaller monkey came and beckoned towards her, so she gently slipped her hand out from under the cheek of the first monkey and followed him. He mated with her while I looked on. Then she returned and gently tried to slip her hand back

---

under the cheek of the first monkey, but he woke up suddenly, smelled her, and cried out. Then the monkeys gathered round and he began screaming while pointing towards her with his hand. The monkeys went all about and came back with that monkey that I recognized. They dug a pit for the two of them and stoned them both. So I had witnessed stoning being carried out by other than Adam's descendants."

Foolish stories like these may have excited the minds of illiterate villagers in ninth century Arabia but surely modern citizens of the 21st century world cannot continue believing that these are the teachings of a prophet.

The reader must bear in mind that this is despite the mullah's claim that the "Al-Jami'us-Sahih of Imam al-Bukhari is rightfully privileged to be called a gigantic ocean serenely flowing for the providence and safeguard of those precious pieces of magnificence".

Here are some more examples of those precious pieces of magnificence:

Bukhari Volume 1, Book 9, Number 490: Narrated 'Aisha: The things which annul the prayers were mentioned before me. They said, "Prayer is annulled by a dog, a donkey and a woman." I said, "You have made us (i.e. women) dogs. I saw the Prophet praying while I used to lie in my bed between him and the Qibla. Whenever I was in need of something, I

---

would slip away for I disliked to face him."

So women are akin to dogs and donkeys.

Bukhari Volume 4, Book 54, Number 537: Narrated Abu Huraira: The Prophet said "If a house fly falls in the drink of anyone of you, he should dip it (in the drink), for one of its wings has a disease and the other has the cure for the disease."

Dunking flies in your tea will spread disease. Here is an adjunct to this strange cure :

(Bukhari Kitabul Ilm vol.2, hadith 77). Mahmood bin Rabe narrates, "I still remember when I was five years old, the Holy Prophet rinsed his mouth and then spat the water into mine"

This is a nonsensical and most unhygienic practice. It will spread even more disease.

(Bukhari, Book of Sales and Book of Nikah 3:59) "After the fall of Khyber, people described the beauty of Safia Bint Hui, the new bride of a slain enemy soldier. The Prophet chose her for himself. On the way to Madina he stopped and had intercourse with her. His companions did not know if she was a wife or a concubine. Later, a veil was drawn between her and the men-folk and they came to know that she was a wife."

---

This is cruel and inhuman treatment of a female war captive. This obviously fake hadith is another manifestation of the mullah's own sexual fantasies. Plus it is a great slander against the good name of the prophet. About the treatment of the enemy and the prisoners of war, the Koran says the following :

9:6 If one of the idol worshipers sought safe passage with you, you shall grant him safe passage, so that he can hear the word of Allah, then send him back to his place of security. That is because they are people who do not know.

Surely even without her asking, the wife of a slain enemy soldier would have wanted to take her husband's dead body back to her people and bury him according to her religious rites. And she would have wanted to remain in a place of security with her people. Secure from molest, sexual advances, rape and harm. But according to the mullahs the prophet had sexual intercourse with her.

The Koran does not tell the prophet to have sexual intercourse with the wives of slain enemy combatants. Such behaviour was more representative of the barbaric or jahiliyya Arabs whom the prophet had come to civilise.

(Bukhari Kitabul Qadr 3:543) A man inquired, "We earn income from these prostitutes so can we do coitus interruptus with them?" The Prophet said, "There is no sin in doing that".

---

This hadith from Bukhari makes the prophet a pimp as well who consented to his companions earning an income from the prostitutes as well as practicing coitus interruptus with them. So from slave trading to sleeping with nine or eleven women in one night to sexual intercourse with the female captives to prostituting women, Bukhari's "pieces of magnificence" make out the prophet of Islam to be a real demon possessed predator.

(Bukhari, Book of Nikah 3:60). The Prophet said, "Bad luck, misfortune and doom can exist in a wife, a home and a horse"

(Bukhari, Book of Nikah 3:61) "After my time, the greatest tribulation for men will be women" (Bukhari, Book of Nikah 3:97) "I saw that most of those entering the gate of hellfire were women"

Again these are slanderous statements against women. Mothers, daughters, sisters, cousins and aunts are like dogs and donkeys. Now they are like horses too. Then they will enter the hellfire in large numbers.

(Bukhari Kitabul Ta'abir) "Seeing a black woman in a dream is the sign of an oncoming epidemic."

This is racist prejudice against black people.

(Bukhari, Book of Medicine, vol.3). Aisha said to the Prophet, "Ah! My head is bursting." He said, "I wish it did." Aisha

---

responded: "You want me to die so that you can spend the next night with another wife"

(Bukhari Kitabul Mahrabain and Kitabut Tib p.254) Some people got sick in Madina. The Prophet advised them to drink camel's urine and milk. After they became well, they killed a shepherd. The Prophet ordered that their hands and feet be chopped off and their eyes gouged out. They were laid on burning sand. When they asked for water it was denied them. So much so that they tasted sand until they died.

More medical prescriptions. From dipping flies in your tea to drinking camels urine as cures. And also gouging out the eyes of the prisoners and cutting off their feet and hands.

(Bukhari Kitabul Fatan 3:718). The Prophet's wives awoke late one morning. He said, "Many women who are dressed up in this world will be raised unclothed in the Hereafter"

Unclothed women. More sexual fantasies from the mullahs.

(Bukhari, Beginning of Creation 2:213) The Prophet used to become very restless and frightened whenever he saw the sky overcast.

This is another slander against the prophet.

(Bukhari, Beginning of Creation 2:231) "The hellfire complained to God, "One part of me is eating the other

---

part." So, the hellfire was allowed two breaths - one in summer and one in winter. That is how you see the change of seasons."

One wonders if Bukhari had any intelligence at all.

(Bukhari Beginning of Creation 2:237) Adhaan (the call to prayer) puts Satan to flight, expelling gas as he runs away. The call to prayer triggers flatulence in Satan.

(Bukhari, Beginning of Creation 2:241) Satan rests at night in your noses Well until he hears the call to prayer.

(Bukhari, Beginning of Creation 2:213) A rooster sees angels, and a donkey sees Satan

(Bukhari, Beginning of Creation 2:244) Rats are the lost tribe of Israel because they drink not the camel's milk, but drink goat's milk

(Bukhari, Beginning of Creation 2:245) Five animals are sinful, so kill them even in Makkah: rat, scorpion, eagle, crow and a biting dog.

(Bukhari, Beginning of Creation 2:247) The Prophet ordered the killing of dogs

(Bukhari, Beginning of Creation 2:251). Woman was created from the rib so she will always remain crooked. Leave her crooked More slander against women.



---

(Bukhari, The Book of Bath 1:193) Maimoona said that she gazed at the Prophet taking a bath after intercourse, until she saw him wash his private parts.

(Bukhari, the Book of Bath 246) Abu Salma and the brother of Aisha went to Aisha to learn about the bath after sexual intercourse. She procured a container of water and took a bath. There was a veil between them and her.

We are to assume that until Maimoona observed the prophet washing his private parts and Aisha gave a practical demonstration to Abu Salma and her brother, the Arab race never knew how to wash after sexual intercourse.

(Bukhari The Book on Menstruation 1:98, chapter 207) If the Prophet wanted to have intercourse with a menstruating wife, he ordered her to tie a loin cloth even though the menstruation would be at its peak. Then he had intercourse.

(Bukhari 1:469, chapter 766) Abu Hurairah narrates that the Prophet said, "I was praying. Satan came in front of me and tried to force me to break my prayers. God gave me control over him and I threw him down. I thought of tying him to a pillar so that you could see him in the morning.

This hadith is obviously fake because the prophet tells us in the Quran that we cannot even see the satan let alone wrestle him. Here is the evidence :

7:27 'The satan and his tribe can see you from places while

---

you cannot see them’.

(Bukhari, KitabTalaq p.143) The Messenger of God addressed his wife Safia as “O’ you bald-headed perished one!”.

(Bukhari, Book of Nikah p.96) When a woman refuses to come to her husband’s bed, angels curse her until she returns

The Holy Prophet passed a group of women. He said to them, “Ladies, give alms, because I have seen you burning in hell in great numbers.” When the women asked the reason for it, he said:

- “You women curse too much!”
- “You are ungrateful to your husbands.”
- “In spite of being deficient in intellect as well as in religion, you are capable of prevailing over a man of wisdom; you are a creation the like of which has never been seen.”
- “Is not the testimony of a woman one half that of a man? This is

the measure of deficiency of your intellect!”

“And mind you, when a woman has her periods she is not allowed to pray or to fast. This is the measure of your deficiency in religion.”

The mullahs boast that from a sample of 600,000 hadith,

---

Bukhari dismissed 597,000 or 99.5% as false and only took 3000 hadith or 0.5% as Sahih or authentic. The examples quoted above are part of this 0.5% authentic hadith.

It is obvious that Bukhari's sample of 600,000 hadith were corrupted beyond 99.5%. There is no way any prophet or messenger would teach such illogical, slanderous and demeaning stories that are obviously false.

The Quran does not tell the prophet to have sexual intercourse with the wives of slain enemy combatants. Such behavior was more representative of the barbaric or jahiliyya Arabs whom the prophet had come to civilize.

(Bukhari Kitabul Qadr 3:543) A man inquired, "We earn income from these prostitutes so can we do coitus interruptus with them?" The Prophet said, "There is no sin in doing that"

This hadith from Bukhari makes the prophet a pimp as well who consented to his companions earning an income from the prostitutes as well as practicing coitus interruptus with them. So from slave trading to sleeping with nine or eleven women in one night to sexual intercourse with the female captives to prostituting women, Bukhari's "pieces of magnificence" make out the prophet of Islam to be a real demon possessed predator.

(Bukhari, Book of Nikah 3:60). The Prophet said, "Bad luck,

---

misfortune and doom can exist in a wife, a home and a horse”

(Bukhari, Book of Nikah 3:61) “After my time, the greatest tribulation for men will be women”

(Bukhari, Book of Nikah 3:97) “I saw that most of those entering the gate of hellfire were women”

Again these are slanderous statements against women. Mothers, daughters, sisters, cousins and aunts are like dogs and donkeys. Now they are like horses too. Then they will enter the hellfire in large numbers.

(Bukhari Kitabul Ta'abir) “Seeing a black woman in a dream is the sign of an oncoming epidemic.”

This is racist prejudice against black people.

(Bukhari, Book of Medicine, vol.3). Aisha said to the Prophet, “Ah! My head is bursting.” He said, “I wish it did.” Aisha responded: “You want me to die so that you can spend the next night with another wife”

(Bukhari Kitabul Mahrabain and Kitabut Tib p.254) Some people got sick in Madina. The Prophet advised them to drink camel's urine and milk. After they became well, they killed a shepherd. The Prophet ordered that their hands and feet be chopped off and their eyes gouged out. They were laid on burning sand. When they asked for water it was

---

denied them. So much so that they tasted sand until they died.

More medical prescriptions. From dipping flies in your tea to drinking camels urine as cures. And also gouging out the eyes of the prisoners and cutting off their feet and hands.

(Bukhari Kitabul Fatan 3:718). The Prophet's wives awoke late one morning. He said, "Many women who are dressed up in this world will be raised unclothed in the Hereafter"

Unclothed women. More sexual fantasies from the mullahs.

(Bukhari, Beginning of Creation 2:213) The Prophet used to become very restless and frightened whenever he saw the sky overcast.

This is another slander against the prophet.

(Bukhari, Beginning of Creation 2:231) "The hellfire complained to God, "One part of me is eating the other part." So, the hellfire was allowed two breaths - one in summer and one in winter. That is how you see the change of seasons."

One wonders if Bukhari had any intelligence at all.

(Bukhari Beginning of Creation 2:237) Adhaan (the call to prayer) puts Satan to flight, expelling gas as he runs away.

The call to prayer triggers flatulence in satan.

---

(Bukhari, Beginning of Creation 2:241) Satan rests at night in your noses Well until he hears the call to prayer.

(Bukhari, Beginning of Creation 2:213) A rooster sees angels, and a donkey sees Satan

(Bukhari, Beginning of Creation 2:244) Rats are the lost tribe of Israel because they drink not the camel's milk, but drink goat's milk

(Bukhari, Beginning of Creation 2:245) Five animals are sinful, so kill them even in Makkah: rat, scorpion, eagle, crow and a biting dog.

(Bukhari, Beginning of Creation 2:247) The Prophet ordered the killing of dogs

(Bukhari, Beginning of Creation 2:251). Woman was created from the rib so she will always remain crooked. Leave her crooked More slander against women.

(Bukhari, The Book of Bath 1:193) Maimoona said that she gazed at the Prophet taking a bath after intercourse, until she saw him wash his private parts.

(Bukhari, the Book of Bath 246) Abu Salma and the brother of Aisha went to Aisha to learn about the bath after sexual intercourse. She procured a container of water and took a bath. There was a veil between them and her.

We are to assume that until Maimoona observed the

---

prophet washing his private parts and Aisha gave a practical demonstration to Abu Salma and her brother, the Arab race never knew how to wash after sexual intercourse.

(Bukhari The Book on Menstruation 1:98, chapter 207) If the Prophet wanted to have intercourse with a menstruating wife, he ordered her to tie a loincloth even though the menstruation would be at its peak. Then he had intercourse.

(Bukhari 1:469, chapter 766) Abu Hurairah narrates that the Prophet said, "I was praying. Satan came in front of me and tried to force me to break my prayers. God gave me control over him and I threw him down. I thought of tying him to a pillar so that you could see him in the morning.

This hadith is obviously fake because the prophet tells us in the Koran that we cannot even see the satan let alone wrestle him. Here is the evidence :

7:27 'The Satan and his tribe can see you from places while you cannot see them'.

(Bukhari, KitabTalaq p.143) The Messenger of God addressed his wife Safia as "O' you bald-headed perished one!".

(Bukhari, Book of Nikah p.96) When a woman refuses to come to her husband's bed, angels curse her until she returns

The Holy Prophet passed a group of women. He said to

---

them, “Ladies, give alms,because I have seen you burning in hell in great numbers.” When the women asked the reason for it, he said:

- “You women curse too much!”
- “You are ungrateful to your husbands.”
- “In spite of being deficient in intellect as well as in religion, you are capable of prevailing over a man of wisdom; you are a creation the like of which has never been seen.”
- “Is not the testimony of a woman one half that of a man? This is the measure of deficiency of your intellect!”

“And mind you, when a woman has her periods she is not allowed to pray or to fast. This is the measure of your deficiency in religion.”

The mullahs boast that from a sample of 600,000 hadith, Bukhari dismissed 597,000 or 99.5% as false and only took 3000 hadith or 0.5% as sahih or authentic. The examples quoted above are part of this 0.5% authentic hadith.

It is obvious that Bukhari’s sample of 600,000 hadith were corrupted beyond 99.5%. There is no way any prophet or messenger would teach such illogical, slanderous and demeaning stories that are obviously false.



---

## HADITH IN THE QURAN

The word hadith means news, information or story. This word hadith and its derivatives appear 28 times in the Quran. Never once in the 28 occurrences is there any reference to such a thing as ‘the hadith of the prophet’. Here are some verses from the Quran which do mention hadith:

39:23 Allah has revealed herein the best hadith (ahsana hadith) a book that is consistent, and points out two ways. The skins of those who reverence their Lord cringe therefrom, then their skins and their hearts soften up for Allah’s message. Such is Allah’s guidance; He bestows it upon whoever wills. As for those sent astray by Allah, nothing can guide them. The Quran states clearly that the best hadith is indeed the Quran itself. All other hadith are therefore less than the best. As for putting faith in non Quranic hadith the following verses disallow it altogether:

45:6 These are Allah’s revelations (ayaat) that we recite to you truthfully. In which hadith other than Allah and His revelations (ayaat) do they believe?

77:50 Which hadith, other than this, do they uphold?

Other than Allah’s revelations or ayaat the Muslims should not be upholding any other hadith or narrations as a source of their guidance. This is a clear injunction in the Koran against non Koranic hadith.

---

The Quran calls itself the best hadith (39:23). The Quran then demands in which other hadith will the Muslims believe other than the verses (ayaat) of the Koran (45:6)? The challenge is repeated in 77:50, in which other hadith will they believe other than the Quran? These questions that are posed in the Koran are not meant to be answered in the affirmative. They are warnings telling the believers not to believe in any hadith other than the Quran.

Unfortunately after the prophet the mullahs have ignored the teachings of the Koran. They have instead been following the false hadith attributed to the prophet by names such as Bukhari, Abu Muslim, Tirmizi and others. The net result is that these non Koranic hadith have led the Muslims completely astray from the Koran and Islam.

Muslims should not believe any non Koranic 'hadith' as originating from the messenger. The prophet would never have said anything outside the Koran and then claimed 'This is my hadith and Sunnah. It is also from Allah and you must follow it'. That would be an impossibility. Perhaps to emphasize this important point the Quran makes a threat upon the prophet:

"I swear by what you see and what you do not see. This is the utterance of an honorable messenger. Not the utterance of a poet; rarely do you believe. Nor the utterance of a soothsayer; rarely do you take heed. A revelation from the

---

Lord of the universe. Had he uttered any other teachings in our name, We would have killed him. We would have stopped the revelations to him. None of you could have helped him” (69:38-47).

This is a very severe warning meant especially for the messenger that is found written in the Koran. If the prophet had uttered anything at all other than the Koran and attributed it to Allah (walaw taqawwa laa layna ba'da al-qa'weeli) then he would have been punished.

Therefore, the non Quranic writings by mullahs like Bukhari known as the

## **MEAT IS MADE HARAM BY ISLAMIC FIQAH**

Islamic fiqah make a big fuss over halal meat. It is another control mechanism which the mullahs have plagiarized from the Old Testament. It is just more mullah intolerance which makes life difficult for Muslims. It also makes the Muslims such poor dinner guests.

Nowhere does the Quran say that an animal needs to be ritually slaughtered before the meat is permissible (halal) for eating. Neither does the Quran say that only a Muslim must slaughter the animal.

The muslim Fiqah for non Quranic ritual slaughter is called

---

zabeeha in Arabic. The Islamic Fiqah have plagiarised their zabeeha from Jewish teachings in this case the Jewish shechita rules for the ritual slaughter of animals.

The Jewish shechita slaughter is performed by drawing a very sharp knife back and forth rapidly across the animal's throat making a single incision incising the main structures of the neck and allowing the blood to drain out. This inflicts severe pain and suffering on the animal.

According to shechita the animal must be killed by a religious slaughterer known in Hebrew as shochet. A shochet must be a god fearing Jew of consistent religious practice.

The Islamic Fiqah non Quranic zabeeha rules are obviously plagiarized from the Jewish shechita. According to Fiqah certain prerequisites must be met before an animal is slaughtered:

- i. The animal must not be a forbidden substance
- ii. The slaughter itself must be done by a sane adult Muslim
- iii. They must use a sharp knife to make a swift, deep incision that cuts the front of the throat, the carotid artery, windpipe and jugular veins.
- iv. Mentioning Allah's name at the time of slaughter is a must.
- v. if other than Allah's name is mentioned then this would be forbidden, due to the verse "5:3 "Forbidden for

---

you are dead animals, and blood, and flesh of swine, and that which has been devoted to other than Allah....”

While the Quran has a very simple and easy determination of what is halal (permissible) and haram the Muslim Fiqah has completely confused the Muslims between halal meat and their own Jewish inspired zabeeha slaughter.

### **What is halal as per the Quran?**

5:4 They ask you what is halal for them. Say, "Halal for you are all good things, including what the dogs (mukallibeen) catch for you." You train them according to Allah's teachings. You may eat what they catch for you, and mention Allah's name thereupon. You shall observe Allah. Allah is most efficient in reckoning.

Whatever is good for you is halal or permissible to be eaten. This is the commandment in the Quran. This is the overriding rule. So it is you who has to decide what is good for you. Seals, walruses, killer whales are good eating for Inuits in the frozen north. There are no sheep, cows and chicken at the North Pole.

In the tropical climates people may eat animals like pigs, porcupines, crocodiles, snakes, kangaroos, locusts, insects and other creatures – besides lamb, goats, cows and chicken. They have been eating these animals since they

---

were created. The human being has found these animals to be good for them.

There is no mention in the Quran about any special slaughter ritual for these animals. For thousands of years all human beings including pre Islamic Arabs, Christians, Hindus and others have known how to slaughter animals for food.

In 5:4 above the Quran says, “including what the dogs (mukallibeen) catch for you.” You train them according to Allah's teachings. You may eat what they catch for you...”

Mukallibeen (plural) means dogs. The singular form is kalb. Some commenters say hunting dogs. Hunting dogs are still dogs. What the dogs catch is halal or permissible for consumption. Hunting dogs bite and tear into animals like rabbit and deer. They do not observe any zabeeha or shechita rituals. Despite this what the dogs catch is halal or permissible for consumption.

The mullahs zabeeha rituals, by which they declare meat haram or prohibited, are not found in the Quran. The Fiqah thereby set themselves higher than Allah. It is more clergy's blasphemy.

Herein also lies their mistake which by their own rules makes the Fiqah's meat haram or 'prohibited' for consumption. According to the Quran, even if they are caught by hunting dogs, the animals are halal for consumption. Hunting dogs

---

are neither jewish or muslim. But like the Jews, the muslim Fiqah insists that if the slaughterer is NOT Muslim then the meat becomes haram.

Even if a non muslim slaughterer says the “bismillah” incantation (in the name of Allah) when he slaughters the animal and observes all the other requirements of zabeeha, the mullahs still say the meat is haram because the slaughterer is not of a Muslim identity.

This is exactly like the Jews saying “a shochet (slaughterer) must be a god fearing Jew of consistent religious practice.” The mullah version is “the slaughter itself must be done by a sane adult muslim.”

## **FAKE BATTLES AND TREATIES**

Islamic literature depicts non Quranic stories that are replete with great battles that were fought between the believers, disbelievers and even between the believers. However, there is no historical evidence from the periods described to verify these stories. For example Islamic literature speak with great pride that the prophet ordered the massacre of between 400 to 900 Jews of the tribe of Bani Quraiza at a place called Yathrib.

The Banu Qurayza (alternate spellings include Quraiza, Qurayzah, and Quraytha) were a Jewish tribe which lived in

---

northern Arabia, at the oasis of Yathrib (presently known as Medina), until the 7th century. In February/March of 627 AD, their conflict with Prophet led to a 25-day siege of Banu Qurayza ending in the tribe's surrender. There is much debate about the number executed with some estimating that between 400-900 males were beheaded, while the Sunni hadith simply state that all male members were killed, without specifying a figure, and one woman. – Wikipedia.

The Jewish people have a reputation for recording and lamenting every single act of cruelty and violence that was committed against them throughout history. Yet strangely they have no record of this massacre of 900 Jewish males of the Banu Qurayza.

The muslim literature also speak of a Battle of Jamal (Battle of the Camel) that was supposed to have taken place between the forces of Aishah (who they say was one of the prophet's wives) and Ali the prophet's son in law. And there was another Battle of Siffin between Muawiyah and Ali.

As described in Islamic history that this was the time of the great conspiracy (fitnah al qubra). These were the great fights which created the murderous split between the Sunnis and the shiahs until this day.

There is certainly no historical evidence that all these battles ever took place. Firstly the prophet is supposed to have



---

married to Aiesha who was according to Sahi Bukhari was 9 years old and his age was 53years.

But the story goes that after the death of another person called Uthman, the so called third Caliph, Aishah wanted her own friends / relatives to become the fourth Caliph. This would go against the appointment of Ali. In the meantime Muawiyah had also declared himself the Caliph in Syria. To make a long fairy tale short, it became all out war. Muawiyah on one side and Ali on the other side at the Battle of Siffin. Then Aishah on one side and Ali on the other side at the Battle of Jamal.

Here is an account of the events preceding the Battle of Siffin between Muawiyah and Ali. "In Syria, disorder and agitation to turmoil continued unchanged. Uthman's shirt, besmeared with his blood and the chopped-off fingers of his wife, Naila, were displayed from the stage. In this manner, Muawiya raised the entire country of Syria against Ali. Ultimately, both the parties, opposed to each other, converged on Siffin where their armies pitched their camps in 37/657. Even at this stage, Ali sent three men, viz. Bashir bin Amr bin Mahz Ansari, Saeed bin Qais Hamdani and Shis bin Rabiee Tamini to Muawiya to induce him to settle for union, accord and coming together. According to Tabari (5h vol., p. 243), Muawiya replied that, "Go away from here, only the sword will decide between us." And this is the

---

account of the events that led to the Battle of Jamal between Aisha and Ali.

“Ayesha, the widow of the Holy Prophet (S), was in Makka for the pilgrimage when Uthman was killed. She had always expected either Talha or Zubayr to succeed him and when she heard of Imam Ali's (A) appointment as Caliph, she was very upset.”

She managed to recruit the support of the powerful clan of Bani Umayyah, to whom Uthman had belonged. The ex-governors of Uthman, who had been replaced by Imam Ali (A), also joined her and the ex-governor of Yemen provided her with the means of financing her war by giving her the treasure he had stolen from Yemen when he was deposed. Talha and Zubayr also joined her, in spite of their oath of allegiance to Imam Ali (A). A large number of aimless drifters were also paid to enlist in the army.

The preparations of war having been completed, Ayesha's army proceeded to Basra. Before leaving, she had asked Umme Salma, a faithful widow of the Holy Prophet (S), to accompany her. Umme Salma had indignantly refused, reminding Ayesha that the Holy Prophet (S) had said that Imam Ali (A) was his successor and whoever disobeyed him, disobeyed the Holy Prophet (S) himself. She also

---

reminded her of the time when he had addressed all his wives saying that the DOGS OF HAWWAB would bark at one of his wives, who would be part of a rebellious mob. She then warned Ayesha not to be fooled by the words of Talha and Zubair who would only trap her in wrong deeds. This advice had a sobering effect on Ayesha, who almost gave up her plan. However, her adopted son, Abdallah bin Zubayr, convinced her to go ahead.

### **The Dogs of Hawwab.**

The story of the Dogs of Hawwab is a dead giveaway that these narratives are fake. It's a lame attempt to lend some credence to this story.

“She (Umme Salama) also reminded her (Aisha) of the time when he (prophet) had addressed all his wives saying that the dogs of Hawwab would bark at one of his wives, who would be part of a stubborn mob. Another version of this story says :

“The story of the dogs of Hawab is not narrated in the nine Sunni books (Saheeh Al-Bukhari, Muslim, Al-Nisa’ei, Ibn Majah, Al-Turmithi, Abu Dawood, Muwatta Imam Malik, Musnad Ahmed and Al-Darumi) except in Musnad Ahmed. Ahmed narrated two versions of the story. Also, the story is found in Saheeh Ibn Habbab, Al-Mustadrik by

---

Al-Hakim, and in history books”.

The story goes as follows :

“Isma’eel narrated from Qays who said, ‘When Ayesha approached the waters of Bani A’amir, she heard some dogs barking. Ayesha asked, ‘What is the location of these waters?’ She was answered, ‘This is the waters of the Hawwab.’ Then she said, ‘I am going back!’ Some of the people with her said, ‘No, you should go on. Then the Muslims would see you and Allah would make peace between them.’ Then she said again, ‘I heard that the prophet peace be upon him said, ‘Then what would you (the wives of the prophet) do when you hear the barking of the dogs of Al-Hawwab ?’” The prophet peace be upon him said to his wives, “Which one of you would be barked at by the dogs of Al-Hawwab?”

According to these hadiths, the prophet had become a fortune teller. He could predict that one of his wives would lead a rebellion. He could predict that the dogs of Hawwab would bark at that wife. The prophet’s soothsaying abilities had picked out dogs as the warners as opposed to say camels or horses that would also be common at that place and time. The prophet could even identify the exact location where the dogs would bark ie at a place called Hawwab. Yet the prophet could not

---

predict exactly which one of his wives would be leading the rebellion. That part of the vision was a little cloudy !

About his soothsaying or fortune telling abilities the prophet said the following:

***7:188 Say: I do not control any benefit or harm for my own soul except as Allah please; and had I known the unseen I would have had much of good and no evil would have touched me; I am nothing but a warner and the giver of good news to a people who believe***

The Prophet could never see into the future. If he could then surely he would have divulged these terrible future events very accurately to his beloved wife (Aisha?), to his believing sahaba (Muawiyah?) to his beloved son in law (Ali ?) so that no calamity would befall his beloved wife, his beloved companions and beloved family members.

But the fact was that the Prophet was no soothsayer. Not only could he not know the unseen but he could never see into the future and see dogs barking at Hawwab.

***52:29 “Therefore continue to remind, for by the grace of your Lord, you are not a soothsayer, or a madman”***

It was not the prophet’s job to predict what would happen in the future. And the following verses too: 69: 39 – 47 But nay! I swear by that which you see, and that

---

which you do not see. Most surely, it is the Word brought by an honored Apostle, and it is not the word of a poet; little is it that you believe; Nor the word of a fortune-teller; little is it that you mind. It is a revelation from the Lord of the worlds. And if he had fabricated against Us any of the sayings, we would certainly have seized him by the right hand, Then We would certainly have cut off his aorta. And not one of you could have withheld Us from him.

The Quran is very threatening here. It reiterates that the Prophet was not a soothsayer. If the Prophet had attempted to say anything other than the Quran and then claimed that it was also from Allah, then Allah says he would have severely punished the prophet of Islam. And no one could have helped the prophet.

Certainly the prophet could not have made fortune-teller type predictions that the Dogs of Hawwab would bark at one of his wives. All this talk about the dogs of Hawab is just fake.

***8:62 And if they intend to deceive you -- then surely Allah is sufficient for you; He it is Who strengthened you with His help and with the believers***

***8:63 And united their hearts; had you spent all that is in the earth, you could not have united their hearts, but***

---

***Allah united them; surely He is Mighty, Wise. 8:64 O Prophet! Allah is sufficient for you and the believers that follow you.***

These verses are especially relevant to Muslims who believe in the Koran. The Koran assures the prophet that Allah had united the hearts of the companions who were with him. This would certainly include Aisha, Ali, Uthman, Muawiyah and others (if they really existed at all).

The Quran says 'Al haqq min al Rabbiq' which means 'the Truth is from the Lord'. So when Allah says (USING THE PAST TENSE) that He has united the hearts of the companions of the prophet, this is a Haqq or statement of Truth from Allah.

If any Muslim then or now doubted this then the Quran reiterates the position: "had you spent all that is in the earth, you could not have united their hearts, but Allah united them; surely He is Mighty, Wise". Allah must have united their hearts. But the mullahs are telling the Muslims that as soon as the prophet died all these promises in the Quran went out the window. It became a scrap in the desert with Ali(r), Muawiyah,(r) Aisha(r) all having a go at each other.

Since the Quran also represents the spoken words of the

---

prophet, it would appear that the prophet too was pulling everyone's legs.

The Islamic religious stories become more incredible when we see these obvious and silly concoctions.

The Quran also lays down the LAW about the relationship between the prophet, his wives and the believers.

***33:6 The Prophet has a greater claim on the believers than they have on themselves, and his WIVES ARE AS THEIR MOTHERS; and the possessors of relationship have the better claim in the ordinance of Allah to inheritance, one with respect to another, than (other) believers, and (than) those who have fled (their homes), except that you do some good to your friends; this is written in the Book.***

The Prophet's wives were like mothers to the believers. Such is their high status. Yet the Religious literature will have us believe that 'the mother of the Believers' by the name of Aishah(r) together with some other companions went tooth and nail against other companions of the prophet whose hearts Allah had united' (8:63).

These are all fabricated stories written in Islamic Literature The truth was that the companions whose hearts Allah had united did not go to war with each other.



---

Neither did the prophet make any predictions about barking dogs at a place called Hawwab.

The Battle of Jamal and the Battle of Siffin never happened. All these stories are just fake.

## **THE FAKE TREATY OF HUDHAYBIYAH**

There is NOT one thing which the Religious clergies practice that can be traced directly to the Quran – NOT ONE.

The Treaty of Hudhaybiyah. Not only is it not stated but the so called Treaty Of Hudhaybiyah which the Islamic Historians have invoked up contradicts the Quran totally.

The so called Treaty of Hudhaybiyah that plays such a large part in Sunni theology is a fake. It is also another false heresy that insults the good name of the prophet. This treaty never happened.

The Treaty of Hudhaybiyah is a fantasy which talks about an agreement between the prophet and the disbelievers (the so called Quraysh). Here is the Treaty of Hudaybiyah.

In drawing up the treaty, the Messenger of Allah summoned 'Ali ibn Abi Talib and told him to write, "In the name of Allah, ar-Rahman ar-Raheem." Suhayl said, "Hold

---

it! I do not recognize ar-Rahman ar-Raheem, but write 'In your name, O my Lord'." The Messenger of Allah told 'Ali to write the latter and he did so. Then he said, "Write 'This is what Muhammad the Messenger of Allah has agreed with Suhayl ibn 'Amr'." Suhayl said, "Hold it! If I witnessed that you were Allah's Messenger I would not have fought you. Write your own name and the name of you father." The Messenger of Allah said, "Write 'This is what Muhammad ibn 'Abdullah has agreed with Suhayl ibn 'Amr'." After these opening lines the treaty between the two sides was written comprising the following clauses:

1. To lay aside from war and refrain from hostilities during the period of the truce.
2. If anyone from Quraysh embraced Islam and came to Muhammad without the permission of his guardian, he would return him to them, and if anyone from those with Muhammad came to Quraysh they need not return him to Muhammad.
3. Whosoever wished from amongst the Arabs to enter into an alliance with Muhammad could do so, and he who wished to enter into an alliance with Quraysh could do so.

---

4. The Muslims and Muhammad's companions had to retire from Makkah that year to return the following year when they would be free to enter Makkah and stay there three nights. They would be allowed to carry swords in their sheaths and nothing more.

5. The treaty was for a limited period of time, ten years from the date of its conclusion.

Let us focus on point number 2 of this treaty :

2. "If anyone from Quraysh embraced Islam and came to Muhammad without the permission of his guardian, he would return him to them, and if anyone from those with Muhammad came to Quraysh they need not return him to Muhammad."

This point alone is sufficient to demonstrate that this treaty never happened in history. It is all fake. What this treaty says is that if anyone from the disbelievers embraced Islam without the permission of his guardian and crossed over to Islam then the prophet was obliged to send them back to the disbelievers.

But in the Quran, Allah and the Rasul say the exact opposite. Here are the relevant verses:

***60:10 "O ye who believe! When there come to you believing women refugees, examine them: Allah knows***

---

***best as to their Faith: if ye ascertain that they are Believers, then send them not back to the Unbelievers. They are not lawful for the Unbelievers, nor are the (Unbelievers) lawful for them. But pay the Unbelievers what they have spent, and there will be no blame on you if ye marry them on payment of their dower to them. But hold not to the***

***guardianship of unbelieving women: ask for what ye have spent on their dowers, and let the (Unbelievers) ask for what they have spent. Such is the command of Allah. He judges between you. And Allah is Full of Knowledge and Wisdom.”***

Pay close attention to these words “Such is the command of Allah” - thalikum hukmu Allahi.

These are Allah’s commands. Certainly women who are refugees have most definitely run away from someone (without their permission). If any such women ran away from the disbelievers and came over to the side of Islam, then the Quran says they shall not be returned to the disbelievers.

But the Treaty of Hdaybiyah says : If anyone from Quraysh embraced Islam and came to Muhammad(mpuh) without the permission of his guardian, he (Prophet)

---

would return him to them.. This Treaty of Hdaybiyah makes a fool of the good prophet. This fake hadeeth has the Prophet entering into a treaty that is exactly opposite of what Allah COMMANDED (HUKUM) in the Quran.

Here is another verse from the Quran that exposes the Treaty of Hudhaybiyah as fake :

***9:6. If one amongst the Pagans ask thee for asylum, grant it to him, so that he may hear the word of Allah and then escort him to a place of safety. That is because they are men without knowledge.***

According to the Quran if a pagan asks the prophet for asylum, the prophet must grant him asylum. After that the pagan must be escorted to a place of safety. The Arabic is very clear : ‘tsumma ablighu ma manahu’ which means ‘then convey him to a place of safety’. But according to the Treaty of Hudhaybiyah not just pagans but even the Muslims must be returned back to the disbelievers. The Treaty of Hudhaybiyah clearly contradicts these verses in the Quran.

Plus the following verses in the Quran which were also taught to us by the Prophet of Islam:

***61.2 “O you who believe! why do you say that which you***

---

### ***do not do?***

We must not say one thing and then do something else – especially things that are exactly opposite of what we say. No double talk.

So the prophet of Islam cannot be saying one thing from the Quran about granting asylum and safety to believers and pagans and then sign a treaty with

the so called Quraish that says the exact opposite of what he has been preaching by sending asylum seekers, pagans and Muslim converts back to the Quraish. 61:3 “It is most hateful to Allah that you should say that which you do not do”.

If the prophet engaged in double talk it would be very hateful to Allah. Hence we can see that this so called Treaty of Hudhaybiyah is a simple fake.

## **THE UTHMANIC RECENSION OF THE QUR'AN**

### **1. DID ABU BAKR'S CODEX HAVE OFFICIAL STATUS?**

---

What, ultimately, was the status of the Qur'an text codified by Zaid ibn Thabit for Abu Bakr? Was it merely a private text assembled for the convenience of the Caliph or was it intended to be an official recension for the growing Muslim community? To answer these questions one has to enquire into what happened to this manuscript after it had been compiled and the information furnished to us reads as follows:

Then the complete manuscripts (copy) of the Qur'an remained with Abu Bakr till he died, then with Umar, till the end of his life, and then with Hafsa, the daughter of Umar (ra). (*Sahih al-Bukhari*, Vol. 6, p.478).

Each one of the three possessors of this codex was a person of considerable prominence. Abu Bakr and Umar were Muhammad's immediate successors, the first and second caliphs of the Muslim world respectively. Hafsa, likewise, was a leading figure, being specifically described in the *Kitab al-Masahif* of Ibn Abi Dawud as both *bint Umar* (the daughter of Umar, p.7) and *zauj an-nabi* (the wife of the Prophet, p.85). The codex was, therefore, certainly retained as the official copy of the first two Muslim rulers and was thereafter committed to an obviously distinctive caretaker of the text. It is another question, however, whether this copy became the official standardised collection of the Qur'an for the whole Muslim community.

---

Any collection made for Abu Bakr, the first caliph of Islam, must nonetheless have had some special status especially as its nominated compiler Zaid ibn Thabit was widely regarded as one of the foremost authorities on the Qur'an text. His effort to compile as authentic a record as he could of the original Qur'an as it was handed down by Muhammad can only be highly commended and the overall authenticity of the resultant codex cannot be seriously challenged. It can fairly be concluded that Zaid's text was one of great importance and its retention in official custody during the caliphates respectively of Abu Bakr and Umar testify to its key significance during the time of the Qur'an's initial codification. There can be little doubt, however, that this codex was at no time publicised during those first two caliphates or declared to be the official text for the whole Muslim world. Desai argues that there was no need to "standardize and promulgate this collection as the only official text" at that time as the Qur'an was, according to him, still perfectly retained in the memories of the huffaz among the companions of Muhammad who remained alive (Desai, *The Quraan Unimpeachable*, p.31). We have already seen that claims for the perfect knowledge of the Qur'an in the memories of the sahaba are based on assumptions and we cannot accept that Abu Bakr's codex was not given any public impact after its compilation because there was no need for this while Muhammad's companions still had it in their memories. It was precisely because Abu Bakr and Umar



---

perceived the need for a carefully codified written text of the Qur'an as against reliance on the memories of men alone that it was put together in the first place.

It is more likely that Abu Bakr and Umar recognised that there were other masters of the text of the Qur'an, such as Abdullah ibn Mas'ud, Ubayy ibn Ka'b, Mu'adh ibn Jabal and others we have already mentioned alongside Zaid ibn Thabit, who were authorities of equal standing with him and who were qualified to produce authentic codices of the Qur'an in written form.

The manuscript compiled by Zaid, highly prized as it was, nevertheless was not regarded with any greater authority than the others once these began to be put together and it was for this reason, therefore, that Zaid's codex was not publicly imposed on the whole community as the officially sanctioned text of the Qur'an.

Zaid's text was, in fact, virtually concealed after its compilation. Upon the death of Umar it passed into the private keeping of Hafsah, very much a recluse after Muhammad's death. Far from being given official publicity, it was virtually set aside and given no publicity at all. Desai suggests that it was "guarded" during those years "for future use" when the *qurra* among Muhammad's companions had finally passed away (*The Quraan Unimpeachable*, p.31), but there is nothing in the earliest records to suggest that Zaid's

---

text was compiled purely through foresight as to future conditions. Rather it was a perceived immediate need for a single written text that occasioned its compilation.

At the time of its codification Zaid knew that his text could not be regarded as an absolutely perfect record as some passages were acknowledged as having been lost and the redactor himself overlooked at least two verses until he was reminded of them by Abu Khuzaima. If Zaid and Abu Bakr were persuaded that his text was unquestionably authentic to the last word and letter, it would almost certainly have been given immediate public prominence.

On the other hand, if Zaid knew that it was only relatively authentic and no more accurate than the many other codices simultaneously being compiled by Abdullah ibn Mas'ud and others, we can understand why it quickly disappeared into relative obscurity. By the time Uthman became caliph, although the other codices were gaining prominence in the various provinces, this codex had in fact receded into the private custody of one of the widows of the Prophet of Islam who simply kept it indefinitely in her personal care. It may have been compiled under official supervision, but it was never regarded as the actual official and solely authentic text of the Qur'an. It had become just one of many codices of equal authority that had been put together at roughly the same time.

---

## 2. UTHMAN'S ORDER TO BURN THE OTHER CODICES.

About nineteen years after the death of Muhammad, when Uthman had succeeded Abu Bakr and Umar as the third Caliph of Islam, a major new development took place in the standardising of the Qur'an text. The Muslim general Hudhayfah ibn al-Yaman led an expedition into northern Syria, drawing his troops partly from Syria and partly from Iraq. It was not long before disputes arose between them as to the correct reading of the Qur'an. They had come from Damascus and Hems, from Kufa and Basra, and in each centre the local Muslims had their own codex of the Qur'an. The codex of Abdullah ibn Mas'ud became the standard text for the Muslims at Kufa in Iraq while the codex of Ubayy ibn Ka'b became revered in Syria. Hudhayfah was disturbed at this and, after consulting Salid ibn al-As, he reported the matter to Uthman. What followed is described in the following hadith:

Hudhaifa was afraid of their (the people of Sha'm and Iraq) differences in the recitation of the Qur'an, so he said to Uthman, 'O Chief of the Believers! Save this nation before they differ about the Book (Qur'an) as Jews and the Christians did before'. So Uthman sent a message to Hafsa, saying, 'Send us the manuscripts of the Qur'an so that we may compile the Qur'anic materials in perfect copies and return the manuscripts to you'. Hafsa sent it to Uthman. Uthman then ordered

---

Zaid ibn Thabit, Abdullah bin az-Zubair, Sa'id bin al-As, and Abdur-Rahman bin Harith bin Hisham to rewrite the manuscripts in perfect copies. Uthman said to the three Quraishi men, 'In case you disagree with Zaid bin Thabit on any point in the Qur'an, then write it in the dialect of the Quraish as the Qur'an was revealed in their tongue'. They did so, and when they had written many copies, Uthman returned the original manuscripts to Hafsa. Uthman sent to every Muslim province one copy of what they had copied, and ordered that all the other Qur'anic materials, whether written in fragmentary manuscripts or whole copies, be burnt. (*Sahih al-Bukhari*, Vol. 6, p.479).

For the first time in the official works of the Hadith literature we read of other codices that were being compiled, in addition to the one done by Zaid for Abu Bakr, and that these were widely accepted and well-known, certainly far more so than the codex of Zaid which by this time was in the private possession of Hafsa. While some of those texts consisted only of a selection of portions, it is clearly stated that others were complete codices of the whole Qur'an.

What was the motive for Uthman's order that these other codices should be destroyed and that the codex of Zaid alone should be preserved and copied out to be sent in replacement of the other texts to the various provinces? Was it because there were serious errors in these texts and

---

that Zaid's alone could be considered a perfect redaction of the original text? There is nothing in the original records to suggest that this was the motive. The following tradition gives a more balanced picture of the circumstances and causes which prompted Uthman's action and why he chose Zaid's codex as the basis on which the Qur'an text was to be standardised for the Muslim community. Ali is reported to have said of Uthman:

By Allah, he did not act or do anything in respect of the manuscripts (*masahif*) except in full consultation with us, for he said, 'What is your opinion in this matter of *qira'at* (reading)? It has been reported to me that some are saying 'My reading is superior to your reading'. That is a perversion of the truth. We asked him, 'What is your view (on this)?' He answered, 'My view is that we should unite the people on a single text (*mushaf waahid*), then there will be no further division or disagreement'. We replied, 'What a wonderful idea!' Someone from the gathering there asked, 'Whose is the purest (Arabic) among the people and whose reading (is the best)?' They said the purest (Arabic) among the people was that of Sa'id ibn al-'As and the (best) reader among them was Zaid ibn Thabit. He (Uthman) said, 'Let the one write and the other dictate'. Thereafter they performed their task and he united the people on a (single) text. (Ibn Abi Dawud, *Kitab al-Masahif*, p.22).

---

The motive is twice stated in this extract to simply be the desire to bring consensus among the Muslims on the basis of a single Qur'an text. It was not to destroy the other manuscripts because they were considered unreliable but rather to prevent future dissension among the inhabitants of the different provinces. Desai, who agrees that these other codices were authentic texts of the Qur'an, states that they were destroyed purely to obtain uniformity in the text. He reasons that Zaid's codex was the "official" text and that the others were unofficially transcribed, but does not regard the variant readings in them as evidence of corruption of the text but rather as illustrative of the fact that, according to a hadith text, the Qur'an was revealed in seven different ways (cf. chapter 5). He says:

The simplest and safest way to ensure the prevalence of the standardized copy was to eliminate all other copies. (Desai, op.cit., p.33).

It was this objective alone - the "prevalence of a standardized copy", the unity of the Muslims on the basis of a single text - that motivated Uthman's action. After all, this was the reason why Hudhayfah had approached him the first place. "It was Hudhayfah who impressed upon Uthman (ra) the need to assemble the texts into a single text" (Ibn Abi Dawud, *Kitab al-Masahif*, p.35), Thus Desai adds that "The gathering and elimination of all other copies besides the standardized text was merely to ensure uniformity" (op.cit.,

---

p.33). Just as Abu Bakr, at the time of the first recension of the Qur'an, had sought to obtain a complete record of the text from all the diverse sources whence it could be obtained, so now Uthman sought to standardise the text as against the varying codices that were gaining authority in the different centres.

Why, then, did he choose Zaid's codex as the basis for this purpose? The tradition quoted above once again underlines the authority that Zaid enjoyed in respect of the text of the Qur'an and the overall authenticity of his codex could not be disputed, It was also done, as we have seen, under official supervision but cannot be regarded as having become the official text, the other codices having been "compiled unofficially" (Desai, op.cit., p.32). Its almost immediate concealment from public view and the lack of publicity given to it are proofs that it was never intended to be regarded as the standard text of the Qur'an.

Unlike the codices which were gaining fame and widespread acceptance in the provinces, Zaid's text was conveniently close at hand and, not being known among the Muslims in those provinces, it was not regarded as a rival text. The standardising of a Medinan text at the seat of Uthman's government also enabled him to suppress the popularity and authority of other reciters in areas where Uthman's rule had become unpopular because he was placing members of his own family, the descendants of Umayya who had opposed



---

Muhammad for many years, in positions of authority over and above many more well-known companions who had been faithful to him throughout his mission. Zaid's text was, therefore, not chosen because it was believed to be superior to the others but because it conveniently suited Uthman's purposes in standardising the text of the Qur'an.

Uthman called for this text and it became promptly transformed from a private text shielded for many years in almost complete public obscurity into the official codex of the Qur'an for the whole Muslim community. It was Uthman who standardised Zaid's codex as the official text and gave it widespread prominence, not Abu Bakr. While Zaid was clearly one of the foremost authorities on the Qur'an his text as compiled under Abu Bakr cannot be regarded as having been more authentic than the others. The "official" supervision of its compilation was only that of the elected successor to Muhammad. Had it been the Prophet of Islam himself who had authorised and supervised the codification of the text, it could well have laid claim to being the official text of the Qur'an, but it was only the product of a well-meaning successor compiled by but one of the most approved authorities on the text. (We are not dealing here with a compilation ordered and supervised by the Prophet of Islam with a divine guarantee of its absolutely perfect preservation but rather with an honest attempt by a young man, ultimately at his own discretion as to what should be



---

included or excluded, and that only under the eye of a subsequent leader, to produce as accurate a text as he possibly could).

Once again it must be borne in mind that, once compiled, Abu Bakr did not impose it upon the Muslim community as Uthman later did, so it cannot be regarded as having become the official codex of the Qur'an before Uthman's time as Desai and others wish to believe.

Uthman's action was drastic, to say the least. Not one of the other codices was exempted from the order that they be destroyed. It can only be assumed that the differences in reading between the various texts was so vast that the Caliph saw no alternative to an order for the standardising of one of the texts and the annihilation of the rest. The fact that none of the other texts was spared shows that none of the codices, Zaid's included, agreed with any of the others in its entirety. There must have been serious textual variants between the texts to warrant such action. One cannot assume that Zaid's text, hidden from public view, just happened to be the perfect text and that, wherever it differed from the others, they must have been in error. Such a convenient shielding of this codex from the disputes about the reading of the Qur'an is unacceptable when the matter is considered objectively.

---

Zaid's text was simply one of a number of codices done by the companions of Muhammad after his death and shared in the variant readings found between them all. In its favour is the consideration that it had been compiled under Abu Bakr by one of the foremost authorities of the Qur'an. Its preference also depended, however, on the fact that, not being widely known, it had been sheltered from the disputes surrounding the others and it was, of course, conveniently close at hand.

Furthermore, it was not an official text as we have seen but a compilation done by just one man, Zaid ibn Thabit, in the same way as those of Abdullah ibn Mas'ud and the others had been compiled. It was not the authorised text of Muhammad himself but simply one form of it among many then in existence and uncorroborated in every single point by the others in circulation. It was compiled under the discretion of only one man and came to official prominence purely because Uthman chose it as the appropriate one to represent the single codex he wanted to establish for the whole Muslim community.

Modern Muslim writers who make bold claims for the absolute perfection of the Qur'an text as it stands today are aware that evidences of a host of different readings in the earliest manuscripts will make such claims sound hollow indeed, so they argue that the differences were not in the

---

texts themselves but only in the pronunciation of the Qur'an as it was recited.

Siddique states this argument in the following way: "'Usman was not standardising one out of several texts. There never was more than one text. 'Usman was standardizing the recitation of the Qur'an and making sure that it would remain in the dialect of the Quraish in which it was originally revealed. He was concerned at points of difference in intonation between Iraqi and Syrian troops in the Islamic army" (*Al-Balaagh*, op.cit., p.2). The claim is that, if there were any differences in reading, they were only in pronunciation, in "the recitation" and "intonation" of the text. This argument is based entirely on faulty premises. Pronunciation, recitation and intonation relate only to a *verbal* recital of the text and such differences would never have appeared in the *written* texts. Yet it was the destruction of these written texts that Uthman ordered.

We need to consider further that, in the earliest days of the codification of the Qur'an in writing, there were no vowel points in the texts. Thus differences in recitation would never have appeared in the written codices. Why, then, did Uthman burn them? There can only be one conclusion the differences must have existed in the texts themselves and, in the following three chapters, we shall see just how extensive those differences were. Uthman *was* standardising one text at the expense of the others and it was not little niceties in

---

the finer points of recitation that occasioned his extreme action against the other codices but the prevalence of a vast number of variant readings in the text itself.

Muslims need to consider and ponder Uthman's action seriously. The Qur'an was believed to be the revealed Word of God and the codices then in existence were written out by the very closest companions of Muhammad himself. What value would be placed on those Qur'an manuscripts if they were still in existence today? These were hand-written codices carefully copied out, some as complete records of the whole Qur'an text, by the most prominent of Muhammad's companions who were regarded as authorities on the text. It was these codices that Uthman eliminated. *Uthman burnt and destroyed complete manuscripts of the whole Qur'an copied out by Muhammad's immediate companions.*

If there had not been serious differences between them, why would he thus have destroyed such cherished copies of what all Muslims believe to be the revealed Word of God? One cannot understand the casualness with which modern Muslim writers justify his action especially if, as Siddique claims, there had never been any differences in the texts. What would Muslims think if anyone had a ceremony today such as Uthman had then, and consigned a number of Qur'ans to the flames, especially if these were cherished hand-written texts of great antiquity? Uthman *burnt* such

---

Qur'an texts and destroyed them. Only one explanation can account for this - there must have been so many serious variant readings between the texts themselves that the Caliph saw only one solution - the establishment of one of these as the official text for the whole Muslim community and the elimination of the others.

While Siddique emphatically declares "One Text, No Variants" and states that "there was never more than one text" (this clause is in bold letters in his article), Desai contradicts him by admitting that there were differences in the earliest texts, such differences including "textual variation" (op.cit., p.22), and by acknowledging that other codices were not necessarily identical to the one compiled by Zaid (p.23). Desai, however, also seeks to maintain the hypothesis that the Qur'an is word-perfect to this day, so he argues that all the variants that existed were part of the divinely authorised seven different readings of the Qur'an and states that, as these readings were not known to all the Muslims, Uthman wisely decided to destroy the evidences in the interests of obtaining a single text. He says:

Hadhrat Uthmaan's measure of eliminating all other authorized and true versions of the Qur'aan Majeed was necessitated by the disputes which arose in the conquered territories - disputes among new Muslims ignorant of the other forms of authorized Qira'at. Since a particular Ustaad imparted only a specific Qira'at, they

---

remained unaware of the other authorized versions. . . . Scrutinizing each and every copy would have proven too laborious and difficult a task. The simplest and safest way to ensure the prevalence of the standardized copy was to eliminate all other copies. (Desai, *The Quraan Unimpeachable*, p.32,33).

So it became expedient to eliminate six authorised forms of Qira'at and retain just one and, although the most meticulous effort must have gone into writing and completing the other codices of the Qur'an, the reading of these texts would have been too much like hard work for the Caliph. One can only marvel at the manner in which such Muslims can unemotionally reason favourably about the wholesale destruction of what are said to have been authentic codices of the book they cherish so dearly. It would be interesting to see what the maulana's reaction would be if someone today ordered a similar destruction of such highly-prized hand-written texts of the Qur'an for such expedient reasons as he gives in these quotes, or if someone decided to make a film of the events surrounding Uthman's decree.

The order to consign all but one of the Qur'ans in existence to the flames at such a crucial time cannot be explained away so lightly. Muslim writers are not seriously assessing the gravity of Uthman's decree. As we shall see, Abdullah ibn Mas'ud reacted very strongly to Uthman's order and we are

---

also informed that when Uthman enquired into the grievances among the Muslims who were rising in opposition to him, one of their complaints against him was his destruction of the other Qur'an codices, that he had "obliterated the Book of Allah" (Ibn Abi Dawud, *Kitab al-Masahif*, p.36). They significantly did not just say it was the *masahif* (manuscripts), the usual word used for the Qur'an codices compiled before Uthman's decree, but the *kitabullah*, the "Scripture of Allah", to emphasise their severe antagonism to his wanton extermination of such important manuscripts of the Qur'an.

In the coming chapters we shall see just how extensive the variant readings were and how strongly the texts of Abdullah ibn Mas'ud, Ubayy ibn Ka'b, Zaid ibn Thabit, Abu Musa and others differed from each other. Let us here, however, briefly consider certain important developments in the standardising of Zaid's text as the preferred text of the Qur'an.

### 3. THE REVISION OF ZAID'S CODEX OF THE QUR'AN.

One would think, in the light of the bold claims that Zaid's text was always absolutely perfect, that even if it could not have been written out originally without a wide search for its contents, its reproduction at this stage would have been a simple matter of copying it out just as it stood. Yet we find even here further evidence that it was not previously looked



---

on with any special favour or regarded as the official text of the Qur'an, for Uthman immediately ordered that a recension of his codex take place and that it be corrected where necessary. The record of what duly transpired reads as follows:

Narrated Anas (ra): 'Uthman called Zaid bin Thabit, Abdullah bin az-Zubair, Sa'id bin Al-'As and 'Abdur-Rahman bin Al-Harith bin Hisham, and then they wrote the manuscripts (of the Qur'an). 'Uthman said to the three Quraishi persons, "If you differ with Zaid bin Thabit on any point of the Qur'an, then write it in the language of Quraish, as the Qur'an was revealed in their language". So they acted accordingly. (*Sahih al-Bukhari*, Vol.4, p.466).

We have already seen that Sa'id ibn al-As was regarded as an expert in the Arabic language and he and the other two redactors were chosen because they came from the Quraysh tribe of Mecca from which Muhammad too had come, whereas Zaid was from Medina. Uthman wanted the standardised Qur'an to be preserved in the Quraysh dialect in which Muhammad had originally delivered it. Accordingly, if these three found themselves differing with Zaid's text at any point, it was to be corrected and rewritten in the original dialect. Once again we cannot possibly be dealing purely with fine points of recitation or pronunciation, for any differences here would not have been reflected in the



---

written text. Uthman clearly had actual amendments to the written text in mind when he summoned the four redactors together.

There is even evidence that Uthman went further than just requiring a committee of four to oversee the recension of Zaid's codex in that he became involved in a general consultation with a number of other prominent Muslims in Medina on the recension of the Qur'an and a more general revision may well have taken place (As-Suyuti, *Al-Itqan fii Ulum al-Qur'an*, p.139).

Not only this but we find yet again that Zaid was to recall yet another verse that had been missing from the text. The record of this incident reads:

Zaid said 'I missed a verse from al-Ahzab (Surah 33) when we transcribed the *mushaf* (the written text of the Qur'an under Uthman's supervision). I used to hear the messenger of Allah (saw) reciting it. We searched for it and found it with Khuzaimah ibn Thabit al-Ansari: "From among the believers are men who are faithful in their covenant with Allah" (33.23). So we inserted it in the (relevant) surah in the text. (as-Suyuti, *Al-Itqan fii Ulum al-Qur'an*, p.138).

A similar record of the omission of what is now Surah 33.23 from the recension done under Uthman is recorded in

---

the *Sahih al-Bukhari* (Vol. 6, p.479). At first sight the story is very similar to the omission of the last two verses of Surat Bara'a in the compilation of the Qur'an text done by Zaid for Abu Bakr. A recension was done, a short passage was found to be omitted, and it was discovered with Khuzaima ibn Thabit. Added to this, as we have seen (page 35), is the hadith that traces the omission of the last two verses of Surat Bara'a (9. 127-128) to the time of Uthman's reign. Siddique, in consequence, states that the story of the missing verse from Surat al-Ahzab really refers to the verses from Surat Bara'a and that the hadith about these verses has a better authority than the tradition about the other verse (*Al-Balaagh*, op.cit., p.2).

It is not possible at this time in history to make any conclusive deductions in this respect, save and except to say that it does appear to be strange that it was only nineteen years after Muhammad's death that Zaid suddenly remembered, for the first time, another verse that was missing from the Qur'an and coincidentally found it with the same companion as the other two verses. We also saw that it was Khuzaimah himself who at that time brought the redactor's attention to the omission of the two verses from Surat Bara'a and, if yet another text was also omitted and known to him alone, it needs to be explained why he remained silent about it.

---

Desai, however, accepts the authority of the hadith at face value and explains the phenomenon by suggesting that Surah 33.23 was indeed included in Zaid's original codex but was overlooked when the copying of the texts took place under Uthman's recension and says, once again, that it was well known to "the numerous other Huffaaz" (*The Quraan Unimpeachable*, p.38). This argument just cannot stand the test of critical analysis.

The *mushaf* from which Zaid and his assistants copied the manuscripts was not destroyed along with the other codices but was returned to Hafsah after the work was complete, so if the relevant verse had been included in it, there would hardly have been any need for a search for it till it was found with Khuzaima. Likewise one cannot believe that, if it was included in the original codex, it suddenly became overlooked every time a copy was made for one of the provinces. To the extent that the hadith reflects a true development in the text of the Qur'an, Desai's argument about the meaning of its omission in the transcribed copies is quite simply untenable and does not hold water.

At face value the hadith can only mean that it was only after Zaid's second recension of the Qur'an text that he recalled the verse for the first time - a not too improbable occurrence if he had not been required to give detailed and exact attention to the actual authenticity of the text of the Qur'an

---

in the years between his completion of the codex for Abu Bakr and Uthman's order for a second redaction.

Siddique argues, on the face value of the hadith, that it once again means that Zaid could not find it in writing with anyone else, implying that it was well-known in the memories of the *sahaba*. He argues against the translation of the hadith as we have given it in Zaid's words, namely "I missed a verse from al-Ahzab.." and says this is "slightly inaccurate" and that it should read "I could not find a verse.." (op.cit., p.2). In other words, Zaid did not entirely overlook the verse but, being well aware of it, merely struggled to find it in writing. The key word here in the hadith is *faqada* which means "to have lost, to be deprived of, to have mislaid", and is used in the context of the bereavement of someone who is deceased. Clearly therefore it means, in the context of this hadith, not that Zaid was trying to find a text in writing that was already well-known to everybody, but rather that he was seeking to recover a verse which had indeed been lost entirely from the text and could only be found with Khuzaima.

To the extent that this tradition is historically true it shows that even Zaid's original attempt to produce a codex as complete as it could be was not entirely successful and it was only after the other manuscripts had been copied out that the relevant verse was hastily included. More and more the arguments for a perfect Qur'an, nothing added or lost

---

with no variants in the text, become untenable and are shown to be the fruits of pious sentiment alone.

#### 4. THE QUR'AN TEXT AS STANDARDISED BY UTHMAN.

Uthman succeeded in his immediate objective, namely to impose a single text of the Qur'an on the Muslim world with the simultaneous destruction of all the other codices in existence. To the extent that the Muslim world today indeed has a single text of its revered scripture, it cannot be said that this text is a precise record of the Qur'an as Muhammad delivered it or that its claim to be inerrant was unchallenged by others which were brought to codification at the same time. It was not Allah who arranged the text exactly in the form in which it has come down but rather the young man Zaid and that only to the best of his ability and according to his own discretion, nor was it Muhammad who codified it for the Muslim *ummah* (community) but Uthman ibn Affan, and that only after a complete revision had taken place with the simultaneous destruction of the other codices which differed from it and which, nevertheless, were compiled by other companions of Muhammad whose knowledge of the Qur'an was in no degree inferior to that of Zaid ibn Thabit.

Even after the final recension of the Qur'an during Uthman's reign disputes still came to the fore in respect of the authenticity of the text. A very good example concerns a variant reading of Surah 2.238 which, in the Qur'an as

---

standardised by Uthman, that is, the Qur'an as it stands today, reads: "Maintain your prayers, particularly the middle prayer (*as-salaatil wustaa*), and stand before Allah in devoutness". The variant reading of this Verse is given in this hadith:

Abu Yunus, freedman of Aishah, Mother of Believers, reported: Aishah ordered me to transcribe the Holy Qur'an and asked me to let her know when I should arrive at the verse *Hafidhuu alaas-salaati waas-salaatiil-wustaa wa quumu lillaahi qaanitiin* (2.238). When I arrived at the verse I informed her and she ordered: Write it in this way, *Hafidhuu alaas-salaati waas-salaatiil-wustaa wa salaatiil 'asri wa quumu lillaahi qaanitiin*. She added that she had heard it so from the Apostle of Allah (may peace be upon him). (*Muwatta Imam Malik*, p.64).

Aishah, a widow of the Prophet of Islam, stated that after the words *wa salatil wusta* ("the middle prayer") the scribe was to insert *wa salatil asr* ("and the afternoon prayer"), giving Muhammad himself as the direct authority for this reading. On the same page there is a very similar tradition wherein Hafsah, the daughter of Umar and another of Muhammad's wives, likewise ordered her scribe Amr ibn Rafi to make the same amendment to her text.

---

This could not have been the codex of Zaid in Hafsah's possession but was most probably a text written out for her before her father Umar died, whereupon she inherited Zaid's codex. Ibn Rafi made it plain he was writing the text at her express command and it is specifically referred to as a separate codex by Ibn Abi Dawud. Under the heading *Mushaf Hafsah Zauj an-Nabi (saw)* ("The Codex of Hafsah, the widow of the Prophet, may the peace and blessings of Allah be upon him") he gives a number of authorities for the tradition we are considering, showing that it was widely known, yet he records no other variant readings in her text. One of these traditions reads as follows:

It is reported by Abdullah on the authority of Muhammad ibn Abdul Malik who reported from Yazid (etc.) ... It is written in the codex of Hafsah, the widow of the Prophet (saw): "Observe your prayers, especially the middle prayer and the afternoon prayer". (Ibn Abi Dawud, *Kitab al-Masahif*, p.87).

We are told that this variant, the addition of the words *wa salatil asr* after the words *wa salatil wusta* was also recorded by Ubayy ibn Ka'b as well as being found in the codex of Umm Salama, another of Muhammad's wives who survived him (Ibn Abi Dawud, op. cit., p.87). It was also recorded by Ibn Abbas.

---

This variant reading must have been recorded by Ubayy ibn Ka'b before the recension of the Qur'an under Uthman as his codex is definitely stated to have been one of those destroyed by Uthman and it is probable that it was so inscribed in the others as well. It did cause some discussion and concern after Uthman's recension, however, and the knowledge of its existence could not be suppressed. Some said it was an exhortation to particularly observe the afternoon prayer in addition to the middle prayer, whereas others said it was merely an elucidation of the standard text (that is, that the *salatil-wusta* was in fact the *salatil-asr*). An example of the latter interpretation reads as follows:

It is said by Abu Ubaid in his *Fadhail al-Qur'an* ("The Excellences of the Qur'an") that the purpose of a variant reading (*al-qira'atash-shaathat*) is to explain the standard reading (*al-qira'atal-mash'huurat*) and to illustrate its meaning, as in the (variant) reading of Aishah and Hafsah, *waas-salaatiil wustaa salaatiil 'asr*. (as-Suyuti, *Al-Itqan fii Ulum al-Qur'an*, p.193).

It was the inability of Uthman to entirely suppress the evidences of such variant readings that led to the destruction of Hafsah's codex during the time when Marwan ibn al-Hakam was governor of Medina (by which time the seat of government in the Muslim world had passed to Damascus in Syria under Mu'awiya, the son of Muhammad's long-standing enemy Abu Sufyan who only became a Muslim



---

upon the conquest of Mecca). While Hafsa was still alive she refused to give her codex up to him although he anxiously sought to destroy it (Ibn Abi Dawud, op.cit., p.24), and he only succeeded in obtaining it upon her death from her brother Abdullah ibn Umar, whereupon he destroyed it fearing, he said, that if it became well-known the variant readings Uthman sought to suppress would again recommence in the recitation of the Qur'an. (There are sources other than Ibn Abi Dawud which attribute other variant readings to Hafsa's codex, for example she read *fii thikrillaah* with Ibn Mas'ud for *fii janbilaah* in Surah 39.56).

The Uthmanic recension of the Qur'an may well have established only one text as the authorised text for the whole Muslim world, but it simultaneously eliminated a wealth of codices which were widely accepted in the various provinces and which had as much right as Zaid's to be recognised as authentic copies. At-Tabari records (1.6.2952) that the people said to Uthman "The Qur'an was in many books, and you have now discredited them all but one", indicating that Zaid's text was not considered to enjoy any preference over them in authenticity or authority. Nevertheless, even though the codices were eliminated, the variant readings between them were recorded and well-known and in the next chapter we shall consider some of these and the codices in which they appeared, in particular those of Abdullah ibn Mas'ud and Ubayy ibn Ka'b.

---

## WHAT DOES THE QUR'AN SAY ABOUT THE JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN SCRIPTURES?

### Christianity, Judaism and Islam

The Qur'an teaches that Islam is the continued faithful religion in the same line as the Prophets who were before Muhammad: *The same religion has He established for you as that which He enjoined on Noah ... and that which We enjoined on Abraham, Moses, and Jesus* (42:13 AYA). The result of this view is that the scriptures given by these Prophets are considered to be genuine scriptures from God: *But say, "We (Muslims) believe in the Revelation which has come down to us and in that which came down to you (Jews & Christians); our Allah and your Allah is One"* (29:46 AYA).

In the Qur'an there are many references to the Jewish and Christian Holy Books. In fact the Qur'an addresses Christians and Jews in terms of the Book: *O People of the Book!* (5:68 AYA).

### God's Mission For The People of the Book

Christians and Jews are mentioned in the Qur'an as the custodians of scripture: *For to them was entrusted the protection of Allah's Book* (5:47 AYA/44 MP). God gave the

---

scripture to the Christians and Jews so that they could make known to the whole world and every nation the true knowledge of God: *And remember Allah took a Covenant from the People of the Book, to make it known and clear to mankind, and not to hide it* (3:187 AYA). Some of the Jews and Christians fulfilled this mission, others did not. Just as there are faithful and unfaithful Muslims so too the Qur'an distinguishes between the faithful and the unfaithful Christians and Jews.

The Unfaithful The Qur'an describes the behavior of unfaithful Christians and Jews as:

**1/** Concealing the truth of the scripture: *Who is more unjust than those who conceal the testimony they have from Allah?* (2:140 AYA).

**2/** Teaching falsely and forgetting what they had heard from their scripture:

There is among them **a section** who distort the Book with their tongues: (As they read) you would think it is a part of the Book, but it is no part of the Book; and they say, "That is from Allah," but it is not from Allah (3:78 AYA).

They change words from their context and forget a part of that whereof they were admonished (5:13 MP/14 AYA).

**3/** Wanting profit from the scriptures:

---

And remember Allah took a Covenant from the People of the Book, to make it known and clear to mankind, and not to hide it; but they threw it away behind their backs, and purchased with it some miserable gain! And vile was the bargain they made! (3:187 AYA)

**4/** Some of the Jews who were transgressors and did not know the Book wrote false scripture:

But the transgressors changed the word from that which had been given them (2:59 AYA).

Among them are unlettered folk who know the Scripture not except from hearsay. They but guess. Therefore woe be unto them who write the Scripture with their hands and then say, "This is from Allah," that they may purchase a small gain therewith (2:78-79 MP).

The Faithful The Qur'an teaches that there are faithful Christians and Jews:

Not all of them are alike: Of the People of the Book are a portion that stand (for the right); they rehearse the Signs of Allah all night long, and they prostrate themselves in adoration. They believe in Allah and the Last Day; they enjoin what is right, and forbid what is wrong; and they hasten (in emulation) in (all) good works: They are in the ranks of the righteous. Of the good that they do, nothing will

---

be rejected of them; for Allah knoweth well those that do right (3:113-115 AYA).

Nearest among them in love to the Believers wilt thou find those who say, "We are Christians": Because amongst these are men devoted to learning and men who have renounced the world, and they are not arrogant (5:85 AYA/82 MP).

According to the Qur'an, the faithful Christians and Jews did not do what the unfaithful did; they obeyed their scriptures and worshipped God. But what about the their scriptures? Does the Qur'an consider the scripture of the Jews and Christians to have been corrupted by the actions of the Unfaithful? Or has it been preserved by the Faithful? Does the Qur'an consider that only part of their scripture now contains truth? To answer these questions we need to consider what the Qur'an says of the Jewish and Christian scripture.

## **The Qur'anic View of the Jewish and Christian Scripture**

**1/** The Qur'an teaches that all scripture should be respected in the same way:

O ye who believe! Believe in Allah and His Apostle, and the scripture which He hath sent to His Apostle and the scripture which He sent to those before (him). Any who denieth Allah, His Angels, His Books, His Apostles, and the Day of Judgement, hath gone far, far astray (4:136 AYA).

---

We believe in Allah, and in what has been revealed to us and what was revealed to Abraham, Ismail, Isaac, Jacob, and the Tribes, and in (the Books) given to Moses, Jesus, and the Prophets, from their Lord: We make no distinction between one and another among them (3:84 AYA).

**2/** The Torah that was given to Moses, and the Gospel that was given to Jesus, are the scriptures that the Jews and Christians now possess:

Those who follow the Messenger (Mohammed), the Prophet who can neither read nor write, whom they will find described in the Torah and the Gospel (which are) with them (7:157 MP).

And when there cometh unto them (Jews) a Scripture (the Qur'an) from Allah, confirming that in their possession (2:89 MP).

Thus, the Qur'an is not referring to scripture that Jews and Christians use to possess in the past, but now are lost. Rather, the Torah given to Moses, and the Gospel given to Jesus, is the scripture that is *with them* (the Christians and Jews) and *in their possession* at the time of Muhammad.

**3/** The Quran teaches that it confirms and explains more fully the previous scripture:

---

This Quran is not such as can be produced by other than Allah; on the contrary it is a confirmation of (revelations) that went before it, and a fuller explanation of the Book (10:37 AYA/38 MP).

Thus, the Qur'an sees itself as the guardian of the message of all scripture: *To thee We sent the scripture in truth, confirming the scripture that came before it, and guarding it in safety* (5:48 MP/51 AYA).

**4/** Does the Qur'an teach that it abrogates the Jewish and Christian scripture? Some may point to 2:106 to say it does.

None of Our revelations do We abrogate or cause to be forgotten, but We substitute something better or similar (2:106, AYA)

However, it is unlikely that this verse is referring to the Christian and Jewish scripture, for just five verses after 2:106 the Qur'an asks Christians and Jews to *bring your proof* (2:111) from their scriptures. This would be an irrelevant and contradictory command if it had just taught that their scripture was abrogated. In fact, just thirty verses after 2:106 the Qur'an says that it makes *no distinction between* (2:136) itself and any of the former scripture. Al-Bukhari records that 2:106 refers to abrogation within the Qur'an itself:

Narrated Ibn Abbas: Umar said, "Ubai was the best of us in the recitation (of the Qur'an) yet we leave (out) some of

---

what he recites". Ubai says, "I have taken it from the mouth of Allah's Apostle and will not leave for anything whatever". But Allah said: "None of our revelations do we abrogate or cause to be forgotten but We substitute something better or similar" (Qur'an 2:106). (Bukhari: vol. 6, hadith 527, p. 489; book 61)

Sura 16:101 also shows that this abrogation has to do with the content of the Qur'an and not the scripture of the Jews and Christians.

And when We exchange a verse in the place of another verse - and God knows very well what he is sending down - they say (to Muhammad), "Thou art a mere forger!" (16:101, Arberry)

**5/A** very important section of the Qur'an which deals with the scripture of the Jews and Christians and their relation to the Qur'an is Surah 5:43-49. These verses record how Jews came to Muhammad to ask him for a decision, and it tells the answer he was to give them.

How come they (come) unto thee (Muhammad) for judgment when they have the Torah, wherein Allah hath delivered judgment (for them)? ... Lo! We did reveal the Torah, wherein is guidance and a light ... And We caused Jesus, son of Mary, to follow in their footsteps, confirming that which was (revealed) before him in the Torah, and We



---

bestowed on him the Gospel wherein is guidance and a light, confirming that which was (revealed) before it in the Torah - a guidance and an admonition unto those who ward off (evil). Let the People of the Gospel judge by that which Allah hath revealed therein. Whoso judgeth not by that which Allah hath revealed: such are evil-livers.

And unto thee (Muslims) have We revealed the Scripture (the Qur'an) with the truth, confirming whatever Scripture was before it, and a watcher over it. So judge between them by that which Allah hath revealed, and follow not their desires away from the truth which hath come unto thee. **For each We have appointed a divine law and a traced-out way. Had Allah willed He could have made you one community. But that He may try you by that which He hath given you (He hath made you as ye are).** So vie one with another in good works. Unto Allah ye will all return, and He will then inform you of that wherein ye differ. (5:43-48, MP)

The key sentence from the above is, *For each We have appointed a divine law and a traced-out way.* This verse is teaching that the different religious groups (Jews, Christians and Muslims), have each been given a divine law (Torah, Gospel and Qur'an) and that each group is to make their decisions based upon what they have been given.

Thus the Qur'an encourages Jews to judge by the Torah:

---

How come they (come) unto thee (Muhammad) for judgment when they have the Torah, wherein Allah hath delivered judgment (for them)? (5:43, MP)

And the Qur'an urges Christians to judge by the Gospel:

Let the People of the Gospel judge by that which Allah hath revealed therein. Whoso judgeth not by that which Allah hath revealed: such are evil-livers. (5:47, MP)

And it encourages Muslims to judge by the Qur'an:

And unto thee (Muslims) have We revealed the Scripture (the Qur'an) with the truth, confirming whatever Scripture was before it, and a watcher over it. So judge between them by that which Allah hath revealed. (5:48, MP)

Again, we see that the Qur'an refers to the scriptures of the Christians and Jews as God's reliable word. Jews and Christians are commanded to consult their scriptures when desiring to know God's will. The Qur'an therefore considers these scriptures to be reliable. Surah 5:43-48 also shows that the Qur'an is not claiming to abrogate (replace) the Gospel and Torah but is a parallel revelation to them.

**6/** *Say: "O People of the Book! Ye have no ground to stand upon unless ye stand fast by the Law, the Gospel, and all the revelation that has come to you from your Lord" (5:71 AYA/68 MP). How can the Jew or Christian, stand fast by the*

---

*Law and the Gospel*, if the Law and the Gospel have been corrupted or abrogated? Again, the assumption of the Qur'an is that the scriptures that the Christians and Jews have is the reliable word of God.

**7/** In the following verse the Books of Moses are referred to as being a reliable source of God's warning: *Nay, is he not acquainted with what is in the books of Moses* (53:36 AYA). Thus, there is no excuse for the one who ignores it.

**8/** A Muslim is instructed, when arguing with a Jew about clean/halal food, to ask the Jew to bring his proof from the Law of Moses. *Say: "Bring ye the Law and study it, if ye be men of truth"* (3:93 AYA). How can he bring the Law and study it to determine the truth if it has been corrupted or abrogated? This scripture must be reliable to make such a command. The same assumption is also seen in the following verse: *And they say: "None shall enter Paradise unless he be a Jew or a Christian." Those are their (vain) desires. Say: "Produce your proof if ye are truthful"* (2:111 AYA).

**9/** In the following verses we see Jews and Christians are urged to teach the truth of their scriptures and to obey them: *Say: "O People of the Scripture! Stress not in your religion other than the truth"* (5:77 MP/80 AYA). *Do ye enjoin right conduct on the people, and forget (to practice it) yourselves, and yet ye study the Scripture?* (2:44 AYA).

---

Christians and Jews could not teach and obey their scriptures if their scriptures were corrupted.

**10/** The scripture from before the time of Muhammad was to be consulted by either Muhammad or his Arab contemporaries if they were in doubt about the message that had been given to Muhammad: *If thou wert in doubt as to what We have revealed unto thee, then ask those who have been reading the Book from before thee* (10:94 AYA/95 MP). Thus this earlier scripture must have been preserved to make such a request.

**11/** Here the former scriptures of the Jews and Christians are appealed to to prove that Muhammad is an authentic prophet.

Those who follow the Messenger (Mohammed), the Prophet who can neither read nor write, whom they will find described in the Torah and the Gospel (which are) with them (7:157 MP).

They say: "If only he would bring us a miracle from his Lord!" Hath there not come unto them the proof of what is in the former scriptures? (20:133 MP).

And lo, it is in the scriptures from the men of old. Is it not a token for them that the (religious) doctors of the Children of Israel know it? (26:196-197 MP).

---

How can these scriptures be appealed to, to prove Muhammad is genuine, if they have been corrupted? The Qur'an must view these scriptures as reliable to make such a request.

### **What are the Jewish and Christian Scriptures?**

From the time of Jesus, the Jews and Christians have always shared the same holy book. In Judaism it is called the *Tonach* or *Hebrew Bible*, and in Christianity, the *Old Testament*. In this book are the Torah, the Prophets, and the Psalms. These are the scriptures of the Jewish Prophets before Jesus. Christians have always honoured and read this scripture that first came to the Jews. This scripture is the first section of the Christian Bible.

There is another book of scripture about which many Jews and Christians do not agree. This book too has been given various names in different cultures. It has been called *The Gospel* or the *New Testament* or the *New Covenant*. Christians accept the Gospel as scripture. This book is the second section of the Bible.

Thus all the scriptures of the Jews and Christians are found in the Bible. There exists today ancient Bibles from the time of Muhammad and hundreds of years before his time. Scholars use these ancient scriptures to show that modern Bibles are genuine.

---

Some people claim that when the Qur'an refers to the Torah or the Gospel that it is not referring to the books Jews and Christians have today. However the Qur'an does not claim this. When the Qur'an speaks of the Torah and the Gospel it is referring to the books which the Jews and Christians possessed at the time of Muhammad.

Those who follow the Messenger (Mohammed), the Prophet who can neither read nor write, whom they will find described in the Torah and the Gospel (which are) **with them** (7:157 MP).

And when there cometh unto them (Jews) a Scripture (the Qur'an) from Allah, confirming that **in their possession** (2:89 MP).

Muhammad lived during the 6th/7th century A.D. We have Bibles from before, during and after this time. This archaeological evidence allows us to be sure that the Torah and Gospel mentioned in the Qur'an are the same books that are found in the Bible today.

This fact is also confirmed by Ibn Ishaq who wrote the earliest biography (Sirat) of Muhammad. He clearly identifies the Gospel mentioned in the Qur'an as what Christians call the New Testament.

Among the things which have reached me about what Jesus the Son of Mary stated in the Gospel which he received from

---

God for the followers of the Gospel, in applying a term to describe the apostle of God, is the following. It is extracted from **what John the Apostle set down for them when he wrote the Gospel for them from the Testament of Jesus Son of Mary** (Ibn Ishaq's "Sirat Rasulallah", translated as "The Life of Muhammad", by A. Guillaume, Karachi: Oxford, 1998, pp. 103-104, bold added.)

Here we see Ibn Ishaq refer to the Apostle John and the Gospel that he wrote. This is simply what Christians call the Gospel according to John and it is part of the New Testament.

## Conclusion

The Qur'an maintains that the Bible is the word of God and no distinction is to be made between any of the holy books. Therefore if you are a Muslim you should not attack the Bible - the Qur'an upholds it!

The Bible is taught to be a source of guidance for Jews and Christians who wish to know the will of God, and so the Qur'an encourages Jews and Christians to obey their scripture and never asks them to deny it. The Qur'an says the Bible foretells the coming of Muhammad and it never says that faithful Jews or Christians have corrupted their scripture.

The Qur'an never asks a Christian or Jew to accept it because their own scripture has become corrupt, rather they are

---

asked to accept the Qur'an because the Qur'an claims, 1/ to confirm the teaching of the Bible, 2/ that Muhammad is foretold in the Torah and Gospel, 3/ the Qur'anic teaching makes clear what the Jews and Christians could not understand properly from their own scriptures. If the Qur'an is to be taken seriously then the claims it makes must be examined. If its claims are true then that is good evidence for accepting it as the Word of God. If its claims are false then it fails its own test and should be rejected.

## RELIGIOUS CLERGIES PROVE THAT PROPHETS CAN BE SINFUL

Speaking about man's origin, the author of the Quran writes:

It is He who created you out of one living soul, and made of him his spouse that he might rest in her. Then, when he covered her, she bore a light burden and passed by with it; but when it became heavy THEY cried to God their Lord, 'If Thou givest US a righteous son, WE indeed shall be of the thankful.' Thereafter, when He gave THEM a righteous son, THEY assigned Him associates in that He had given THEM; but God is high exalted above that they associate. What, do they associate that which creates nothing and themselves are created, and that have no power to help them, neither they help themselves? S. 7:189-192



---

Here is another version:

He it is who hath created you from a single person, and from him brought forth his wife that he might dwell with her: and when he had known her, she bore a light burden, and went about with it; and when it became heavy, THEY both cried to God THEIR Lord, "If thou give US a perfect child WE will surely be of the thankful." Yet when God had given THEM a perfect child, THEY joined partners with Him in return for what he had given THEM. But high is God above the partners they joined with Him! What! Will they join those with Him who cannot create anything, and are themselves created, and have no power to help them, or to help themselves?  
J.M. Rodwell

The context makes it quite clear that the man and woman spoken of here are Adam and Eve. Apparently, the author of the Quran assumed that the first parents, after receiving a child from God, fell into idolatry. The Quran fails to tell us just how exactly did the progenitors of the human race fall into idolatry, and what or whom did they associate with Allah. Thus the preceding passage is another example of just how incoherent and garbled the Quran truly is.

Some Muslims, apparently out of embarrassment, try to say that the passage is referring to some of Adam's children committing idolatry. This is despite the fact that the text directs the charge of idolatry to the first man and woman

---

after their first sexual experience that resulted in conception and child bearing.

Secondly, certain Muslims have understood the story to be referring to Adam and Eve. An example of this is the renowned and premiere Muslim historian Al-Tabari, who writes:

Let us now return (to our narrative) and provide further clarification concerning the error of those who said that the first to die on earth was Adam, and who denied that the two whose story is told by God in His word: "And recite to them the story of the two sons of Adam truthfully! They offered a sacrifice," came, as shown by this verse, from Adam's loin.

According to Muhammad b. Bashshar - 'Abd al-Samad b. 'Abd al-Warith - 'Umar b. Ibrahim - Qatadah - al-Hasan - Samurah b. Jundub – the Prophet: None of Eve's children survived. Therefore, she vowed that if one of her children were to survive, she would call him 'Abd al-Harith. When a child of hers survived, she called him 'Abd al-Harith. That was due to Satan's inspiration.

According to Ibn Humayd – Salamah – Ibn Ishaq – Dawud b. al-Husayn – 'Ikrimah – Ibn 'Abbas: Eve would give birth to Adam's children and make them worship God, calling them 'Abdallah, 'Ubaydallah ("Servant, or little Servant of God"), and the like. But then they would die. Now, Iblis came to her

---

and to Adam and said: Were you to give them other names, they would survive. So, when she gave birth to a male child for Adam, they called him 'Abd al-Harith. IN THIS CONNECTION, God revealed His word: "It is He Who created you from a single soul" to "the two set up for Him associates in connection with what He had given them" to the end of the verse.

According to Ibn Waki' – Ibn Fudayl - Salim b. Abi Hafsah – Sa'id b. Jubayr, commenting on (the same verse): "When she became heavy (with child), they called on God, their Lord" to "And God is above your associating (others with Him)," as follows: When Eve became heavy with her first pregnancy, Satan came to her before she gave birth, and said: Eve, what is that in your womb? She said: I do not know. He asked: Where will it come out, from your nose, your eye, or your ear? She again replied: I do not know. He said: Don't you think, if it comes out healthy, you should obey me in whatever I command you? When she said: Yes, he said: Call him 'Abd al-Harith! Iblis - May God curse him!- was called al-Harith. She agreed. Afterwards, she said to Adam: Someone came to me in my sleep and told me such-and-such. Adam said: That is Satan. Beware of him, for he is our enemy who drove us out of Paradise. Then Iblis - May God curse him! - came to her again and repeated what he had said before, and she agreed. When she gave birth to the child, God brought him out healthy. Yet, she called him 'Abd al-Harith.

---

This is (meant by) God's word: "They set up for Him associates in connection with what he had given them" to "And God is above your associating (others with Him)."

According to Ibn Waki' –Jarir and Ibn Fudayl - 'Abd al-Malik – Sa'id b. Jubayr: When (Sa'id) was asked whether Adam associated (others with God), he replied: God forbid that I should assume that Adam did that! However, when Eve was heavy with child, Iblis came and said to her: Where will this one come out, from your nose, your eye, or your mouth? He thereby caused her to despair (because she did not know and was afraid of what was going to happen). Then he said: Don't you think that, when it comes out perfectly formed – Ibn Waki' said that Ibn Fudayl added: without harming or killing you - you should obey me? When she agreed, he said: Call him 'Abd al-Harith, and she did. Jarir added: So Adam's associating (others with God) was only in the name.

According to Musa b. Harun - 'Amr b. Hammad –Asbat – al-Suddi: So she - meaning Eve - gave birth to a boy. Iblis came to her and said: Call (pl.) him my servant (*'abdi*)! If you don't, I shall kill him. Adam said to him: I obeyed you (once before), and you caused me to be driven out of Paradise. So he refused to obey him and called the child 'Abd al-Rahman "Servant of the Merciful One." Satan - May God curse him!- gained power over the boy and killed him. Eve bore another child, and when she gave birth to it, Satan said: Call him my servant! If you don't, I shall kill him. Adam said to him

---

(again): I obeyed you (once before), and you caused me to be driven out of Paradise. So he refused and called the boy Salih, and Satan killed him. The third time around, Iblis said to Adam and Eve: If you (pl. want to) overcome me, call him 'Abd al-Harith! Iblis' name was al-Harith. He was called Iblis when he was bedeviled (*ubliṣa*) - became confused. This (is meant by God's word) where He says: "They set up for him associates in connection with what He had given them" - meaning in connection with the names.

Those who, as I have mentioned, have transmitted (reports) that some children of Adam and Eve died before them, and the even more numerous transmitters and statements not mentioned by us, contradict the statement of al-Hasan transmitted on his authority that the first person to die was Adam. (*The History of al-Tabari, Volume 1 - General Introduction and from the Creation to the Flood*, trans. Franz Rosenthal [State University of New York Press, Albany 1989], pp. 320-322; capital and underlined emphasis ours)

In regard to the name Al-Harith, the translator writes:

916. Al-Harith, as explained in these traditions, was the original name of Iblis. By naming the child "Servant of al-Harith (Iblis)," instead of "Servant of God," Adam and Eve associated Satan with God; they were thus exposed to the accusation of having introduced polytheism. Satan's opportunity came because during her first pregnancy, Eve

---

was totally ignorant of the process of human reproduction and feared that she might produce a nonhuman animal. It was God's doing that the child was born without any defects, even if Satan tried to claim credit for it. (p. 320)

The translator also explains why, according to the tradition of al-Suddi, Adam named his second son Salih:

924. The choice of the name results from the use of the adjective *salihan* in Qur. 7:190. (p. 322)

The word *salihan* refers to the Quranic statement that Allah gave Adam and Eve a good child:

But when He gives them a *good one (salihan)*, they set up with Him associates in what He has given them; but high is Allah above what they associate (with Him). Shakir

Ibn Sa'd reports something similar to al-Tabari:

Subsequently Eve conceived and bore Shith and his twin sister 'Azura. He was named Hibat Allah (the gift of Allah); this name was derived from Habil, so Gabriel said to her when she gave birth to him: This is the gift of Allah in exchange for Habil and it is in Arabic Shith, in Syriac Shath and in Hebrew Sheth. Adam made his will for him. The day when Shith was born Adam was one hundred and thirty years old. "And when he covered her she bore a light burden, and she passed (unnoticed)

---

with it". Then he said: She stood and sat. Then Satan came to her in disguise and said to her: O Eve! What is this inside of you. She replied: I know not. Then he said: May be one of the beasts like these. Then she said: I know not. Then he drew away from her till she felt some heaviness in her. Thereupon he appeared again before her and said: O Eve! How do you feel? She said: I am afraid it may be deformed like one with which you have frightened me, I can't remain standing when I stand. Then he suggested: If I pray to Allah I hope He will form him a human being like you and Adam, only if you name him after me. She said: Yes. Then he turned away from her and she said to Adam: An informer came to me and said to me that in my womb was a beast, and I also feel some burden and fear it may be as he has informed me. There was no worry to Adam and Eve save this, till she delivered it. About this Allah says: "They cried unto Allah, their Lord, saying: If Thou givest unto us aright we shall be thankful". This was their prayer before the delivery. When a perfect boy was born to them, he (Satan) came to her and said: Will you not name him after me as you have promised? She asked him: What is your name? His name was 'Azazil. If he had mentioned this name she would have recognized him, so he said: My name is Harith. Thereupon she gave him the name of 'Abd al-Harith who died, and Allah said: "But when He gave them aright, they ascribed unto Him Partners in

---

respect of that which He had given them. High is He. Exalted above all that they associate (with Him)". (Ibn Sa'd, *Kitab Al-Tabaqat Al-Kabir*, Volume I, Parts I & II, English translation by S. Moinul Haq, M.A., PH.D assisted by H.K. Ghazanfar M.A. (Kitab Bhavan Exporters & Importers, 1784 Kalan Mahal, Daryaganj, New Delhi-110 002 India], pp. 24-25)

The two Jalals agree that these verses refer to Adam and Eve:

He, that is, God, it is Who created you from a single soul, namely, Adam, and made, created, from him his spouse, Eve, that he might take rest in her, and become intimate with her. Then, when he covered her, when he had sexual intercourse with her, she bore a light burden, namely, the sperm-drop, and moved to and fro with it, that is, she came and went [easily] on account of its lightness; but when she became heavy, because of the child growing inside her, and they became anxious that it should be a dumb child, they cried to God their Lord, 'If You give us one - a child - that is sound, unimpaired, we indeed shall be of the thankful', to You for it. (*Tafsir al-Jalalayn*; [source](#))

But when He gave them a sound one, [a sound] child, they ascribed to Him associates (*shurakā'a*: a variant reading has *shirkan*, meaning *sharīkan*, 'an associate') in



---

that which He had given them, by naming it 'Abd al-Hārith, 'servant of al-Hārith', when it is not right to be a 'servant' ('*abd*') of any one but 'God' [sc. '*Abd Allāh*'], but this [namesake '*Abd*'] is not an association [of another with God] in terms of servitude, for Adam was immune [from a sin such as associating others in worship with God]. Samura [b. Jundub] reported that the Prophet (s) said, 'On one occasion when Eve gave birth - all the children she bore had failed to survive - Satan visited her and said [to her], "Name it [the child] 'Abd al-Hārith, and it will live.'" She named it so and it lived. This [affair] was the result of Satan's inspiration and his doings': **reported by al-Hākim, who deemed it [the report] 'sound' (*sahīh*), and [also reported] by al-Tirmidhī, who considered it 'fair-uncommon' (*hasan gharīb*)**; but exalted is God above what they, the people of Mecca, associate, in the way of idols (this sentence is consequent, a supplement to [the one beginning with] *khalaqakum*, 'He created you', so that what comes between the two is a parenthetical statement). ([source](#); bold and underline emphasis ours)

As does the *Tafsir* attributed to Ibn Abbas:

(He it is who did create you from a single soul) the soul of Adam alone, (and therefrom did make his mate) and from the soul of Adam he created his wife Eve (that he might take rest in her) with her. (And when he covered

---

her) and when he made love to her (she bore a light burden, and she passed (unnoticed) with it) she stood up and sat down because of pain, (but when it became heavy) when the child became heavy in her womb, they thought, because of Satan's whispering, that it was a beast (they cried unto Allah, their Lord, saying: If thou givest unto us aright) if you give us a sound human being (we shall be of the thankful) for it. (*Tanwîr al-Miqbâs min Tafsîr Ibn 'Abbâs*; [source](#))

(But when He gave unto them aright) a sound human being, (they ascribed unto Him partners) **they made Iblis A PARTNER** (about that which He had given them) in naming that which he had given them of offspring: they called him 'Abdullah and 'Abd al-Harth. (High is He exalted above) Allah absolves Himself from (all that they associate (with Him)) of idols. ([source](#); bold, capital and underline emphasis ours)

These men are followed by al-Wahidi who wrote:

(He it is Who did create you from a single soul...) [7:189] up to (... but are themselves created) [7:191]. Said Mujahid: "Initially, all the children of Adam and Eve died in their infancy. And so, Satan whispered to them: 'If a boy is born to you, call him 'Abd al-Harith [the slave of al-Harith]'. The name of Satan was, prior to that, al-Harith. Adam and Eve did as he asked them to do, hence

---

the words of Allah, exalted is He: (But when He gave unto them a right, they ascribed to Him partners in respect of that which He had given them...)"'. ('Ali ibn Ahmad al-Wahidi, *Asbab al-Nuzul*; [source](#))

In light of the foregoing we can safely conclude that the Quran accuses the first human parents of being the first to commit idolatry and the sin of association. What is even more interesting is that certain Muslims, as narrated by al-Tabari, place the bulk of the blame on Eve (whether realizing it or not) since she supposedly ignored her husband's warnings not to listen to Satan and named her son after the Devil anyway.

### **The Event of Worship to the Golden Calf**

Idol worship and the golden calf was mentioned in Sura 4:153. Now let us have a closer look at this specific story.

In Sura 20:85, Allah told Moses "We have tested thy people in thy absence; the Samiri has led them astray". Allah did not place any blame on Aaron. Aaron admitted that he did no wrong: "O my people! Ye are being tested in this ... so follow me and obey my command" (20:90).

Since Moses knew this (because Allah told him already), why did he place the blame on Aaron? "O Aaron! What kept thee back, when thou saw them going wrong, from following me?

---

Didst thou then disobey my order?" (20:92). And why did he drag him by the hair (7:150)? These two accounts contradict. According to 7:151, Aaron was partly responsible for the sins of his people because Moses prayed for Aaron's forgiveness. And this time (contrary to his other confession), Aaron admits to idol making/idol worshipping in verse 150 "because of the people who nearly killed him when he tried to resist it". But seemingly he gave in and did as they demanded.

Furthermore, in 7:149, the people repented about worshipping the golden calf **before** Moses returned, but according to 20:91 they refused to repent but rather continued to worship the calf until Moses came back.

### **Do not say, "Three"!?**

The following "contradiction" is dedicated to the eminent Muslim scholar and top apologist of Islam, Osama Abdallah, who loves to understand statements only in a hyperliteral way, to the point of the ridiculous. The reason for the publication of this little gem — sufficient to invalidate the whole Qur'an all by itself —

In the Qur'an, we find the following command:

... So believe in Allah and His messengers, and say not "Three" - Cease! (it is) better for you! ... S. 4:171 Pickthall

---

The Qur'an is very clear: People should believe in Allah and His messengers and not say the word "three." More specifically, they should not say the Arabic word for three.

On the other hand, Muslims are expected to recite the Qur'an in Arabic. Traditionally, at least during Ramadan, the complete Qur'an is recited in most mosques. That is impossible to do without also reciting the word for three in this verse (and plenty of other verses as well, cf. S. 2:196, 228, 3:41, 4:3, 19:10, 24:58, 56:7, 77:30, etc.).

In a nutshell: It is impossible to recite S. 4:171 without being disobedient to the command it contains.

This must be the shortest contradiction or logical problem contained in the Qur'an.

Some translation wrote in brackets (Mabood), but again question rises which religion is considering three Mabood among Jewish , Christians and muslims?

**O People of the Book! Exceed not the limits in your din (religion), and speak nothing but the truth about Allah's glory. The fact is simple that the Messiah, 'Isa, the son of Maryam (Jesus, the son of Mary) is Allah's Messenger and His Word which He conveyed to Maryam (Mary) and a Spirit from Him. So believe in Allah and His Messengers and do not say: 'There are three (Gods).' Refrain (from this belief); (that) is best for you. Verily, Allah is the Only One God, Holy is He, far above having a son. Whatever is in the heavens and whatever is in the earth (all) belongs to Him alone. And Sufficient is Allah as a Guardian.**

---

Furthermore how a small portion of Christianity is mentioned who say “heaven” “word” and Holy Ghost”(Gospal james 5:7) one God.

## **Jesus and Muhammad: their roles and natures**

[James M. Arlandson](#)

(**Part One**, [Part Two](#), [Appendix](#))

Who was Jesus, really? Who was Muhammad? What were their roles? What does the Quran say about Muhammad, and what does the New Testament say about Jesus? Does either of these persons claim to have a divine nature? Are both strictly and only human?

This two-part article (plus an appendix) seeks to answer these questions according to the sacred texts of each Founder. In Part One, we analyze the four main titles that the Quran uses of Muhammad: warner, announcer or bringer of news, prophet, and messenger. In Part Two, we analyze the main titles of Jesus in the New Testament, primarily the Four Gospels, such as Messiah, prophet, the Son of God, and several more.

## **Muhammad: his roles and nature**

---

To understand Part One, it is crucial to know about Muhammad's Hijrah (Emigration or Flight) from Mecca to Medina in AD 622. He receives revelations in both cities. While he lived in Mecca, traditions say that they came on him in AD 610, and at first he was unclear about their meaning. Then he gradually takes on his role of warner and messenger. Under persecution, he has to leave Mecca behind, and he arrives in Medina. At this major stage, the revelations change in tone. He becomes bellicose. He raises a lethal band of raiders and eventually a large army. Textual reality of the Quran reflects this historical reality.

Do these four roles change once he arrives in Medina, or not?

To see the Quran in several translations, go to these sites. [This one](#) has multiple translations; and [this one](#) has three.

The [Appendix](#) references the Quranic verses that contain these four titles of Muhammad. It also adds up the total number of times these titles appear in the verses. It is the foundation of Part One.

What is the one main characteristic that links together the following five titles or qualities that are used of Muhammad in the Quran?

## **(1) Mortal man**

---

Muhammad plainly says that he was a mortal human, like all men.

First, in the following Meccan verse Sura (Chapter) 17, he answers the charge that [he cannot perform miracles](#). Allah commands his messenger to "say" the following to his critics.

17:93 . . . *Say, "Glory to my Lord. Am I anything but a mortal, a messenger?"* . . . (MAS Abdel Haleem, *The Qur'an*, Oxford UP, 2004)

Thus, the reason Muhammad cannot perform them is that he is a mere messenger. He does not explicitly deny this accusation and positively proclaim that he can do them.

Second, Sura 39:30 was received in Mecca, and Muhammad is verbally separating off the true believers from the untrue. When Judgment Day comes, each side will see the truth because death will reveal it, even his own death:

39:30 *You [Prophet] will surely die, and so will they [disbelieving Meccan polytheists]* (Haleem, the second insertion is mine)

Haleem supplies the word "prophet" in brackets, but as we shall discover below, the more apt description of Muhammad in Mecca is "warner" or "messenger."



---

Third, Sura 41:6 was received in Mecca and uses similar heated rhetoric against the Meccan polytheists. Allah tells his warner to "say" these words to them:

41:6 *Say [Prophet], "I am only a mortal like you" . . .* (Haleem, his insertion)

Muhammad goes on to say that God revealed to him that God is One. The implication is that the polytheists must change their religion and beliefs.

Finally, Sura 3:144 was revealed after the Battle of Uhud in AD 625, three years after Muhammad's Hijrah or Emigration from Mecca to Medina. His army lost the battle in theory, but in practice he did not lose much materially, so he quickly recovered. But he asks his followers this question, predicated on his mortality.

3:144 *Muhammad is only a messenger before whom many messengers have been and gone. If he died or were killed, would you revert to your old ways?* (Haleem)

Muhammad dies of a fever in AD 632. "*Narrated 'Aisha: The Prophet died while he was between my chest and chin*" . . . ([Bukhari](#)).

## **(2) Warner**

Muhammad was called to warn people about impending judgment and punishment and the fires of hell. The Arabic

---

word for this title is *nadhīr*, and it is used about 125 times in the Quran as a grand total. Interestingly, this word—as it relates directly to Muhammad—appears 58 times in the Meccan suras, but it declines to only 7 times in the Medinan suras, after Muhammad immigrates there in AD 622. Five examples suffice to illustrate this title.

First, Sura 74 is believed to be one of the first chapters in its entirety that was revealed to Muhammad in Mecca. It shows him wrapped in garments, fearful of Allah's revelations. Allah through Gabriel has to get his attention physically to get him to obey—to warn the polytheists.

*74:1 O you (Muhammad) enveloped in garments! 2 Arise and warn! (Hilali and Khan, The Noble Qu'ran, Riyadh, Darussalam, 2002, their insertion)*

Second, in Mecca, Muhammad warns polytheists who deny the truth.

*92:12-16 Our part is to provide guidance— 13 this world and the next belong to us— 14 so I warn you about the raging Fire, 15 in which none but the most wicked will burn, 16 who denied [the truth], and turned away. (Haleem, his insertion)*

Third, the warner [can perform no miracle](#). So people question him about this inability.

---

13:7 *The disbelievers say: "Why has no miracle been sent down to him from his Lord?" But you [Muhammad] are only there to give warning . . . (Haleem, my insertion)*

His only miracle is the Quran. He challenges people to produce a sura or chapter like it, and modern native speakers of Arabic have done just that—[not a difficult feat](#).

Fourth, [Sura 7](#) (and Sura 6) is considered one of the last suras to be revealed in Mecca, and here Muhammad clearly states his function or role.

7:184 *Do they not reflect? There is no madness in their companion (Muhammad). He is a plain warner.* (Hilali and Khan, *The Noble Qur'an*, Darussalam, 2002; insertion is theirs; cf. 7:188)

Fifth and finally, Muhammad is also sent to warn Jews and Christians. According to Sayyid Abul A'La Maududi, [Sura 5](#) comes down around AD 628, six years after Muhammad's Hijrah and four years before his death. Muhammad deals mostly with Jews, but he often discusses Christian doctrine—as he misunderstands it. In this verse he warns People of the Book or Jews and Christians (the Book is the Bible).

5:19 *People of the Book, Our Messenger [Muhammad] comes to you now, after a break in the sequence of messengers, to make things clear for you in case you should*

---

*say, "No one has come to give us good news or to warn us."*  
(Haleem; insertion is mine)

What is Muhammad warning the Jews and Christians about? The context says that they lived in darkness and that Christians are wrong to say that God is the Messiah, the son of Mary; he says that Allah could have destroyed the Messiah. Also, Jews and Christians are punished for their sins. Thus, Muhammad is a warner about their errors and their impending punishment.

From Sura 74 (Muhammad's beginning in Mecca) to Sura 7 (his ending in Mecca), he is primarily a plain warner. The passage in Sura 5 represents only six others in Medina. Thus, Muhammad drops this title for the most part.

### **(3) Announcer or bringer of news**

In Arabic, *bashir* means a bringer of news, usually good, [but sometimes bad](#). It is used 87 times in the Quran. Muhammad uses it of himself 22 times in Mecca, and 13 times in Medina. The first three passages were revealed in Mecca, and the last two in Medina.

First, this news that Muhammad brings exhorts the Meccans to worship none but Allah.

---

11:2 . . . *[W]orship none but Allah. Verily I (Muhammad) am to you from Him a warner and a bringer of glad tidings.* (Hilali and Khan, insertion in parentheses is theirs)

Often, when the words "warner" and "bringer" are juxtaposed, they are intended to contrast with each other, as in this verse. Muhammad warns about judgment and punishment, but he also brings good news.

Second, this verse also shows the two functions of announcer or bearer and warner. "We" refers to Allah.

17:105 *And with truth We have sent it down (i.e. the Quran), and with truth it has descended. And We have sent you (O Muhammad) as nothing but a bearer of glad tidings . . . and a warner.* (Hilali and Khan, insertions are theirs)

Muhammad is supposed to use the Quran to announce news to people.

Third, this verse in Sura 19 also says that Muhammad should use the Quran itself or Sura 19 as a means to announce and warn.

19:97 *We have made it [the Quran or this sura] easy, in your own language [Prophet], so that you may bring glad news to the righteous and warnings to a stubborn people.* (Haleem; first insertion mine, though taken from Haleem's footnote; second insertion his)

---

Again, Haleem supplies the title "prophet" in brackets in this Meccan sura, but the Quran uses it only two times explicitly of Muhammad in Mecca. A more accurate term would have been "warner."

Fourth, besides Sura 5:19, which was quoted in the previous section and which also has the dual role of *nadhira* and *bashira*, these verses were revealed in Medina, and Muhammad's roles are the same.

*33:45 Prophet, We have sent you as a witness, as a bearer of good news and warning, 46 as one who calls people to God by His leave, as a light-giving lamp. (Haleem)*

Fifth and finally, Muhammad preaches the good news to the believers in Medina.

*61:13 And He will give you something else that will really please you: His help and an imminent breakthrough. [Prophet], give the faithful the good news. (Haleem, his insertion)*

#### **(4) Prophet**

The Arabic word *nabi* or "prophet" derives from Hebrew and Aramaic (*nabi* in Hebrew, n<sup>e</sup>bi'a in Aramaic) and appears about 92 times in the Quran. In Islamic theology, a *nabi* is one who receives revelations from Allah. It is especially noteworthy that Muhammad's formal title "prophet"

---

increases dramatically in the Medinan suras (33 times), much more than in the Meccan suras (2 times). But this must be emphasized: it is not necessarily the quantity or number of times that a title appears that is important, but its quality or content in context matters most. On the other hand, the number of times that "prophet" is applied to Muhammad at Mecca is shockingly low, and this cannot be ignored, either.

### *Muhammad at Mecca*

The small number of verses (two) in Mecca that uses "prophet" explicitly and formally of Muhammad comes late in his life in Mecca. The verses in Mecca that *imply* that Muhammad is a prophet (see the [Appendix](#) and scroll down to Table 3) are omitted from this analysis since the arguments over them could go on indefinitely. It is better to analyze the two remaining clear verses.

First, in Sura 7:157, revealed late in Mecca, Muhammad is called an unlettered prophet:

*7:157 Those who follow the messenger, the Prophet who can neither read nor write, whom they will find described in the Torah and the Gospel . . .* (Mohammed Marmaduke Pickthall, *The Glorious Qur'an*, Tahrike Tarsile, 2000; see Suras 29:48 and 62:2, which also speak of his illiteracy but without the word "prophet").

---

The word (*ummi*) translated here as "who can neither read nor write" may mean "gentile" (as Haleem translates the word). The translators and commentators are divided, but in my opinion the general and stronger meaning is illiterate. (For more information on the topic, particularly articles arguing the other opinion, see [this page](#).) Maybe both meanings are true at the same time. He was an illiterate gentile.

Be that as it may, Muhammad clearly connects himself to the Bible, asserting that he has been described in it and implying that he has been predicted in it. Muslim propagandists have searched for clear references to Muhammad in the Torah and the Gospels (and the entire Bible), but their search has come up empty and proven unsuccessful, as explained in the articles on [this page](#). (Also see [this article](#), and [this one](#)). The absence of any reference in the Bible to Muhammad as some sort of future spokesman for God is not surprising. He lived way outside of the Bible's parameters and long after Jesus Christ. The New Testament authors expend great effort to demonstrate that Jesus fulfills the promises and prophecies in the Hebrew Bible. And in his case the evidence is clear and overwhelming.

See [Consummation and Abrogation](#) and [How Jesus Christ fulfills the Old Testament](#).



---

Second, in Sura 7:158 Muhammad repeats that he is an illiterate prophet.

*. . . So believe in Allah and his messenger, the Prophet who can neither read nor write . . .* (Pickthall)

Again, Muhammad uses the word *ummi*, which is best translated as illiterate. He wants us to believe that the Quran is a miracle. Since he repeats this claim, we should take a little more time to explain why it is overblown.

In an age of oral traditions and storytelling, when not many could read or write or could barely do this, memory in some people was strong. They could recite their stories and poems without supernatural benefit. Further, Muhammad in fact confuses many Biblical narratives, so how inspired was he? The God of the Bible certainly did not inspire Muhammad's confusion and partial knowledge. Also, he has help from the literate who copied down the words of his recitations. Thus, none of this is so difficult or miraculous.

A revealing contrast can be seen in the ancient Greek poet Homer, who lived about 1,300 years before Muhammad, according to traditional dating. Most scholars agree that the blind poet Homer was illiterate, so he produced the *Iliad* orally (it is rare to find a specialist who doubts the oral production of this epic). The poem is skillfully arranged, sustaining a unified plot with many characters for over

---

12,000 lines, all of which are set in meter. This is completely different from the Quran. Its arrangement is scattered and hodge-podge, and it does not sustain a meter throughout its composition. Moreover, the *Iliad* expresses an elaborate theology, which does not fall behind the Quran in the slightest iota. In fact, it could be argued justly that singing about a pantheon of gods is more difficult than reciting verses about only one god. Homer has to keep track of their roles in the war between the Greeks and the Trojans, not to mention the roles of the humans. So is the Quran a miracle? It does not rise to the level of the pagan poet Homer—not even close. As noted, suras in the Quran have been [easily duplicated](#).

To sum up Sura 7:157-158, it is not so much the number of times that a title appears that is important, but its quality or content matters most. However, the quantity is surprisingly low, so this is a factor. Also, the quality of the two verses is low. Muhammad says that the Torah and Gospels predict his coming, but Muslims polemicists have not succeeded in finding these predictions in a convincing manner, not to mention even [indirectly](#). (Also, see [this article](#)). Clearly, Muhammad was feeling his way in this new title for himself. Allah first called him primarily as a warner. The Quran later designates him with the formal title of "prophet," or Muhammad grew into it, as he saw it.

*Muhammad at Medina*

---

As noted, the Quran's use of the title of "prophet" increases dramatically when he moved to Medina (33 times). Only two serve as examples.

First, this verse asserts that Muhammad is the "seal" of the prophets, or the final and best one, confirming previous prophets.

*33:40 God's Messenger is not the father of any one of you men; he is God's messenger and the seal of the prophets (Haleem)*

The context of the words "God's Messenger is not the father of any one of you men" reveals that Muhammad wants his "ex" daughter-in-law who had been married to his adopted son. (Go [here](#) for more information.) For more information critical of Muhammad being a "seal" of the prophets, see [this analysis](#).

The general Muslim understanding is that messenger is a greater title than prophet, especially highlighted in this verse as a "seal". But see this confusing issue discussed and clarified [here](#).

Second, he defends himself against accusations that he has dishonestly taken something from the spoils of war.

*3:161 It is inconceivable that a prophet would ever dishonestly take something from the battle gains. (Haleem).*

---

We should not fail to note that this verse merely implies that he is a prophet, fitting under the category of "a prophet" generally in the Appendix. Maududi says that this accusation arose during the Battle of Uhud (AD 625), when the archers abandoned their post and prematurely lunged for the spoils of war, helping to cause the defeat of the Muslims (*The Meaning of the Qur'an*, vol. 1, note 114, p. 283).

But perhaps Muslims were complaining about his unjust distribution generally, and this verse does not apply to the Battle of Uhud. See [this article](#) on Muhammad's use of money to win and keep converts. This is a [short commentary](#) on Sura 9:60, by Ibn Kathir, a classical commentator, who concludes that Muhammad used money in this way.

This section is the most important, since "prophet" involves divine revelation and perhaps a linkage to Biblical prophets. So it deserves further analysis. Why does Muhammad's use of the title "prophet" increase so dramatically after he moves to Medina? This is likely due to two factors.

First, Muhammad grows in his sense of prophethood as he defines it. In Mecca, he reserves this honor mostly for Biblical prophets (10 times) and only twice explicitly for non-Biblical prophets. At the same time, "warner" is used more times (58) than all titles combined in Mecca, but it decreases dramatically in Medina (7 times). Is there a correlation between rise and fall of the titles "warner" and "prophet"?

---

Perhaps the reason is simple. "Warner" does not imply someone who receives divine revelations as clearly as "prophet" does. But more research needs to be done on this topic.

Second, in Medina, Muhammad's contact with Jews increases exponentially, who thrived in that city before he got there (he will eventually expel and slaughter and enslave them). He uses the title for Biblical prophets 19 times in Medina. Maybe this indicates that he wants the Jews to see him as a continuation of the Biblical tradition of prophets. After all, the educated Medinan Jews knew the Hebrew and Arabic word for "prophet" (*nabi*). However, the Jews correctly rebuffed him mainly because he was a gentile, and he did not know the Hebrew Bible adequately. Thus, he fell outside of the Biblical canon.

For more reasons why he does not fit into the Biblical traditions of prophets, see [this article](#).

## **(5) Messenger**

By far the title that is used most often of Muhammad is "messenger" or "apostle" or *rasul* in Arabic. It appears about 360 times in the Quran, but 20 times it is applied to Muhammad at Mecca, and 167 times to him in Medina. Generally, *rasul* means someone who is sent on a mission, whereas *nabi* means someone who has the capacity to

---

receive a divine message. Only two examples are necessary to catch the meaning, as Muhammad defines himself.

First, in addition to Sura 5:15-19, which says that Muhammad is the messenger to the People of the Book (Jews and Christians), he lumps together unbelieving Jews and Christians with idolaters in this Medinan sura.

*98:1 The disbelievers—those of the People of the Book who disbelieve and the idolaters—were not about to change their ways until they were sent clear evidence, 2 a messenger from God, reading out [reciting] pages [blessed with] purity, 3 containing true scriptures . . . . 6 The disbelievers—those People of the Book who disbelieve and the idolaters—will have the Fire of Hell, there to remain forever. They are the worst of creation. (Haleem, first insertion mine, second his)*

The unbelieving Jews and Christians—and the context indicates that they do not believe in the messenger and his message—will live in the Fire of Hell forever.

Second, Allah has sent the messenger to the believers, as well.

*3:164 God has been truly gracious to the believers in sending them a Messenger from among their own, to recite His revelations to them, to make them grow in purity, and to teach them the Scripture and wisdom—before that they were clearly astray. (Haleem)*

---

Why such a dramatic increase in the title of messenger from Mecca (20 times) to Medina (167 times)? The answer is sketchy, but two possibilities may be offered. First, he levels the playing field, so to speak. Everyone who is sent by Allah is merely a messenger without a divine nature—even Jesus (according to Muhammad's misunderstanding of him). Second, it is possible that the increase corresponds to his sense of mission. The verb "send" is related to the noun *rasul*. Muhammad has been sent or commissioned to the inhabitants of Medina and the whole world.

## Summary

The most interesting section is "Prophet." Muhammad uses the title of himself explicitly as a formal title only two times in Mecca, and they come late. He says in Sura 7:157 that he is described (and therefore predicted) in the Torah and Gospels, but Muslim propagandists have been unsuccessful in finding this prediction in these two sections of the Bible (or anywhere else). Thus, he was in error about this, perhaps only guessing and hoping against hope that this could be proven. Since he was illiterate (or could barely read or write), how could he prove this? He certainly was not a scholar who pored over dusty Bible manuscripts. Furthermore, it appears that this title does not reflect Muhammad's original calling, according to Allah's account of him primarily as a warner in the Meccan suras of the Quran.

---

Thus, Muhammad seems to grow into the role of prophet as he defines it.

His original and primary calling was a warner (58 times in Mecca), and perhaps we can add "bringer of news" (22 times in Mecca) and "messenger" (20 times in Mecca). But the word "warner" is used far more times than "prophet" and the other titles in Mecca—more than all of them combined. However, it must be emphasized that it is not necessarily the quantity or number of times of a title's appearance in a sacred text that matters most, but it is the quality or content of the title's context. The Meccan contexts of "warner" and "bringer" and "messenger" are strong. But in two late verses (Sura 7:157 and 158) about Muhammad's claim to prophethood as a formal title, one of them erroneously asserts that he is described in the Bible. Both verses report the truth that he is illiterate and a gentile, depending on the translation of *ummi*, or he is both at the same time. Since he was illiterate, he confuses the Bible narratives. Since he was a gentile, he is disqualified from being a Biblical prophet. Therefore, his official title of Prophet, coming late in Mecca and standing outside of the Bible, is weak, when we measure it against his whole life and against the other three titles.

This is especially true and evident when he constantly recounts the stories of Biblical prophets, as if he lines up with them. However, if he had just said plainly that he is not



---

part of the Biblical canon and had ignored the Bible, then his claim to prophethood would not be as problematic.

Translators who supply the title "prophet" in the Meccan suras are wrong. The better term is "warner."

At the beginning of this article (Part One of Two), the question was asked about the quality or attribute that links all of these five titles or descriptions together. The four roles (warner, bringer, prophet, and messenger) are defined by the first description analyzed in Part One, [here](#). They all agree on this one point. Muhammad is a mortal man like all of us. He is a human warner, a human announcer or bringer of news, a human prophet, and a human messenger. He never claimed divinity for himself.

His mortality is a major reason why he objects so strenuously to the divinity and Sonship of Christ (Suras 3:58-60; 4:171; 5:72-75, 116; 9:30; 19:33-34). If Muhammad is the best and last prophet and messenger, then how can Jesus surpass him, as the eternal Son of God? He also objects because of his odd belief that God must have [physical relations](#) to produce a son, a notion that Christians reject. The next part of this two-part article explains the Scriptural basis of Christ's deity.

---

## The Challenge of the Quran

**Its Implications for the Muslim Corruption Charges**  
**In several places the Quran challenges the unbelievers to produce something similar to it:**

And if you are in doubt as to that which We have revealed to Our servant, then produce a chapter like it (*min mithlihi*) and call on your witnesses besides Allah if you are truthful. But if you do (it) not and never shall you do (it), then be on your guard against the fire of which men and stones are the fuel; it is prepared for the unbelievers. S. 2:23-24

Or do they say: He has forged it? Say: Then bring a chapter like this (*mithlihi*) and invite whom you can besides Allah, if you are truthful. S. 10:38

Or, do they say: He has forged it. Say: Then bring ten forged chapters like it (*mithlihi*) and call upon whom you can besides Allah, if you are truthful. S. 11:13

Say: If men and jinn should combine together to bring the like of this Quran (*bimithlihi hatha al-Qurani*), they could not

---

bring the like of it, though some of them were aiders of others. S. 17:88

Or do they say: He has forged it. Nay! they do not believe. Then let them bring an announcement *like it* (*mithlihi*) if they are truthful. S. 52:33-34

Based on these verses, Muslims are convinced that the Quran is absolutely unique and unparalleled. For many it is an important element in their belief in the divine origin of the Quran that nobody was ever able to meet this particular challenge. The various issues around the challenge *to bring a Surah like it* are discussed in detail in the section [Is the Qur'an Miraculous?](#) In this current article we want to focus on the amazing fact that there are statements in the Quran which acknowledge that this challenge has already been met! The Quran asserts that the revelation given to Moses is similar and equal to the Quran. Consider the following passage:

Now that the Truth has come to them from Us, they are saying: "Why is he (Muhammad) not given the like of what was given to Musa?" Have they not rejected that which was given to Musa before? They claim: "These (Torah and Qur'an) are the two works of sorcery complementing each other!" And they say: "We believe in neither." Ask them: "Bring a Book from Allah which is a better guide THAN THESE

---

TWO, I will follow it, if what you say be true!" S. 28:48-49  
Malik

Muhammad challenges the unbelievers to bring a book which is not only a better guide than the Quran, but also better than the book of Moses!

[ Note: There exists a variant reading in Sura 28:48. However, most translators render the passage similarly to the above quoted translation by F. Malik, and Ibn Kathir also bases his comments on this version. The variant readings of this verse are discussed in the article, [Books or People?](#), in the section on "[Different Versions of the Qur'an](#)". ]

Ibn Kathir's commentary reads:

*<Two kinds of magic, each helping the other!>*

‘Ali bin Abi Talhah and Al-‘Awfi reported that Ibn ‘Abbas said **that this refers to THE TAWRAH and the Qur’an**, because Allah says next ...

*<Say: "Then bring a Book from Allah, which is a better guide than these two that I may follow it.">*

Allah often mentions the Tawrah and the Qur’an together, as in the *Ayat* ...

*<Say: "Who then sent down the Book which Musa brought, a light and a guidance to mankind ..."> until ...*

---

*<And this is a blessed Book which We have sent down.>  
(6:91-92)*

And at the end of the same Surah, Allah says ...

*<Then, We gave Musa the Book, to complete (Our favor)  
upon those who would do right> (6:154) ...*

*<And this is a blessed Book which We have sent down, so  
follow it and have Taqwa of Allah, that you may receive  
mercy> (6:155).*

*(Tafsir Ibn Kathir (Abridged) Volume 7 (Surat An-Nur to Surat  
Al-Ahzab, Verse 50), abridged by a group of scholars under  
the supervision of Shaykh Safiur-Rahman Al-Mubarakpuri  
[Darussalam Publishers & Distributors, Riyadh, Houston,  
New York, Lahore; First Edition, August 2000], p. 418; cf.  
[online edition](#); bold and capital emphasis ours)*

This presumes that the book of Moses was (a) available during Muhammad's time, and (b) equal to the Quran in terms of guidance. The Quran goes on to state that the previous scriptures are similar to it, being just *like it (mithlihi)*, the very same expression as found in the verses quoted at the beginning of this paper:

Say: Have you considered if it is from Allah, and you disbelieve in it, and a witness from among the children of Israel has borne witness of one like it (mithlihi), so he

---

believed, while you are big with pride; surely Allah does not guide the unjust people ... And before it the Book of Musa was a guide and a mercy: and this is a Book VERIFYING (it) IN the Arabic language that it may warn those who are unjust and as good news for the doers of good. S. 46:10, 12 Shakir

Ibn Kathir comments:

*<(at the same time), a witness from among the Children of Israel has testified to something similar>*

meaning, 'the previous Scriptures that were revealed to the Prophets before me all testify to its truthfulness and authenticity. They have prophesied, well in advance, about things *similar* to that which this Qur'an informs of.' Concerning Allah's statement ...

*<and believed>*

'this person who testified to its truthfulness from the Children of Israel, due to his realization that it was the truth.'

*<while you rejected (the truth)!>*

'whereas you have arrogantly refused to follow it.' Masruq said: "That witness believed in his Prophet and Book, while you disbelieved in your Prophet and Book." (*Tafsir Ibn Kathir (Abridged) Volume 9 (Surat Al-Jathiyah to the end of Surat Al-Munafiqun)*, First Edition: September 2000, pp. 52-53; cf. [online edition](#))

---

Sir William Muir writes:

A Jew, either residing in the vicinity of Mecca, or having visited it perhaps from Medina or elsewhere,—at any rate known at Mecca,—is quoted to the people of Mecca as bearing testimony to the correspondence of the Corân **with the Jewish Scriptures**, and accordingly believing in it. "Does not this," says Mahomet, "prove the divine inspiration of the Corân, and yet ye proudly reject it?"

*So Baidhâwi,—*

على مثله مثل القرآن وهو ما في التوراة من المعاني المصدقة القرآن المطابقة له  
أو مثل ذلك وهو كونه من عند الله فأمن أي بالقرآن لما رأي من خبر الوحي  
مطابقاً للحق

"*To the like-thereof, i. e. like the Corân, and the meaning is that the contents of the Tourât (Pentateuch) **by their purport attest the Corân, as corresponding therewith, or resembling it**;—and thus prove its being from God. And believed, that is, in the Corân, when he (the Jew) saw the intimations of Inspiration corresponding with the truth.*" (Sir William Muir, *The Corân: Its Composition and Teaching*, [p. 84](#); bold emphasis ours)

Note the structure of the argument: assuming the divine origin of the Torah, the author of the Quran argues that because the Quran is "like the Torah", therefore it is of divine origin as well. In this context at least, the Quran seeks

---

to derive its authority from the authority of the Torah. However, the relation of "being like it" is symmetric, i.e. "the Quran being like the Torah" implies also "the Torah being like the Quran". Thus, based on the testimony of the Quran itself, the Torah *is like it*, and therefore meets the above quoted challenge "to bring something like it".

The evidence provided in this article has several implications.

It is evident from the above citations that the author of the Quran believed that the Holy Bible, or at least the book of Moses, met the Quran's challenge to produce something *like it*. Yet if, as Muslims often claim, the book of Moses had been tampered with then how can a corrupted text BE LIKE THE QURAN seeing that it is no longer purely divine in origin? How can human additions match the so-called divinely inspired Quranic text? Are we to assume that the author of the Quran was asserting that a corrupted text claiming to be the book of Moses was of equal value as the Quran? Obviously not, which means that:

**1. The Quran presumes that the previous Scriptures existed in a pure form during Muhammad's time.**

Furthermore, the Torah had to be readily available for comparison (a) with the Quran and (b) with those hypothetical competitors, should somebody take up the



---

challenge "to bring a book better than these two". Neither the argument for the Quran based on its similarity to the Torah (S. 46:10) nor the challenge to bring a book better than the Torah (S. 28:49) would make any sense if the Torah is not available to actually perform the necessary comparison.

Our main point bears repeating: The Quran makes the statement that the Torah (as it was readily available at Muhammad's time) is equal to the Quran in value of guidance and "is like it". If Muslims want to maintain their charge that the Torah was corrupted, i.e. its text being "human" and uninspired, then this implies that the Quran is no better than a human product. This would be an absurd conclusion. Thus, the obvious assumption behind the formulations found in the Quran verses is that **the Torah is in its entirety of divine origin**, and the Quran is as well. The Quran neither states that the Torah was corrupted before the time of Muhammad, nor does it contain any warning or prophecy that such a corruption would happen in the future. It assumes and endorses the authority of the Torah without any reservations.

For a comprehensive discussion regarding the crucial topic of the relationship between the Qur'an and the previous scriptures, please see the various articles listed in the section "[What the Qur'an Says About the Bible](#)". Moreover,

---

**2. the Quran teaches that at least parts, if not all, of the previous Scriptures are similar to the Quran, and even match it, in terms of content and guidance.**

In light of the foregoing, the only thing that a Jew or Christian need to do for the purpose of meeting the Quran's challenge is to present citations from the Holy Bible, which is actually vastly superior to the Quran.

We would like to emphasize explicitly that from the Christian perspective there is no comparison between the Holy Bible and the Quran, contrary to what the Quran claims. The Holy Bible is the inspired inerrant word of the true God, and the Quran is not. The Quran is only a very poor imitation of God's true and pure word.

Those Muslims who despite all the evidence to the contrary still insist that the Quran teaches the corruption of the earlier scriptures, will have to face another dilemma:

**1. If you accept the Quran's verdict that the Torah is like it (S. 28:49, 46:10), then the challenge was met before it was issued. It will be hard to avoid the implication that this challenge was published rather thoughtlessly, which in turn questions its alleged divine origin. [Further reasons why this challenge is invalid are discussed in the section "[Is the Qur'an miraculous?](#)"] Even more, this assumption of a corrupted Torah**

---

would result in an internal contradiction in the Quran: According to the above quoted passages, S. 2:24 and 17:88, the author of the Quran claims it is impossible for men (and jinn) to bring anything that is "like it". If, however, the Torah of Muhammad's time and ours is not the original divinely inspired text but the product of *human* efforts of change and corruption, and the Quran still says that "it is like it" (S. 46:10), then this becomes a plain contradiction.

2. You reject this statement of the Qur'an regarding the Torah being like it. Why then would you believe the Qur'an to be from God if you reject what it says as being wrong?

**Summary:** When performing a careful analysis of *all* statements found in the Quran in regard to the Jewish and Christian scriptures, the conclusion can only be that the Quran teaches that these scriptures are genuinely the Word of God and upholds their integrity and authority. The widely propagated Muslim polemic that the Bible (including the Torah) has been corrupted and is no longer the original divinely inspired text, leads to several problems and absurdities. It places the Quran itself on the level of a corrupted text, since the Quran claims to be like the Torah, it turns the challenge of the Quran into a farce since in that case it has been met before it was issued, and it creates an internal contradiction in the Quran as the Quran then states

---

both, that the challenge cannot be met, but also admits that there is a book (the Torah) which fulfills the challenge.

By making the charge of Bible corruption, Muslims are denying the clear message of the Quran. They have to reject several statements of the Quran to uphold this polemic. On the other hand, if Muslims were to follow the genuine teaching of the Quran that the Torah is truly the word of God, and accept the reasoning of the Quran, which seeks to derive its authority from "being like the Torah" and the Torah's divine authority, then they would have to denounce Islam as false, since the Quran irreconcilably contradicts the Torah on many essential teachings. The Quran only claims to be in confirmation of the Torah and the Gospel, but actually is in sharp contradiction to both the Jewish and the Christian scriptures that it appeals to.

The above discussion of the passages S. 28:48-49 and 46:10, 12 is merely one small aspect of a foundational dilemma for Islam. Several hundred years after the death of Muhammad and completion of the Quran, Muslims have developed their theory of Bible Corruption because they realized the teachings of Bible and Quran contradicted each other. However, this theory fails to achieve its purpose, i.e. to maintain the authority of the Quran. This is the dilemma:

**1. Acceptance of the integrity and divine authority of the Bible as taught in the Quran leads necessarily to the**

---

conclusion that the Quran is not from God because it contradicts the earlier revelations of God while it claims to confirm them and to bring the same teaching only in a different language.

2. The Bible Corruption polemic contradicts the plain teaching of the Quran and implies that the Quran contains absurd statements and internal contradictions. This also has to lead to a rejection of the Quran as being the Word of God.

Under neither of these assumptions can it be maintained that the Quran is the Word of God.

## The Place of Women in Pure Islam

by M. Rafiqul-Haqq and P. Newton

Contents	-
<u>Men's</u>	<u>Superiority</u>
<u>Women's</u>	<u>Deficiencies</u>
<u>What is a</u>	<u>Woman?</u>
<u>Husband's</u>	<u>Rights</u>
<u>Woman's</u>	<u>Rights</u>
<u>Man's</u>	<u>Prerogatives</u>
<u>The Significance of the Marriage Contract</u>	

---

## The Significance of the Dowry Spiritual Standing of Women Conclusion

The purpose of this booklet is to consider the place of women in the pure teaching of Islam. It must be recognised that not every Muslim, nor every Muslim nation follows all of these teachings. These teachings come from both the Qur'an and the Hadith. The Hadith is 'The Tradition of Mohammad', that is, the stories of Mohammad's deeds and sayings. This Hadith is of

**"paramount importance side by side with the Qur'an in the formation of the religious life of a human being and for the attainment of perfection. Indeed a Qur'an minus Hadith remains unintelligible in many cases in the work- a-day life of a man." [1]**

The commentator Jalal-ud-Din as-Suyouti said that the Hadith "is the commentary on the Qur'an and its explanation" [2] This is why almost all commentaries rely in the first place on the Hadith to explain the Qur'an. The authentic Hadith is believed to be

**"nothing short of revelation, [for the Qur'an says of Mohammad] "he does not speak out of low desires. It is not but inspiration which is inspired (Q. 53:3-4)." The only**

---

**difference between the Qur'an and the Hadith is that whereas the former was revealed directly through Gabriel with the very letters that are embodied from Allah, the latter was revealed without letters and words."**[3]

"Thus, next to the Holy Qur'an, the Hadith is the second source of the Islamic Law of social and personal behaviour, because the commandments of the Holy Prophet are as binding on the believers as the commandments of Allah. 'Whenever Allah and the Apostle have decided a matter, it is not for a faithful man or woman to follow a course of their own choice (Q. 33:36).'"[4]

The Hadith is to be followed exactly "for that which differs from the Hadith to the extent of a hair shall be given up."[5]

**"A Muslim therefore stands in absolute need of a copy of the Qur'an and a copy of the Hadith for the guidance of his life"**[6]

## MEN'S SUPERIORITY

The Qur'an expresses the equality of the works of the sexes and the oneness of origin of the sexes in the following verses.

**"And their Lord answereth them, 'I will not suffer the work of him among you that worketh, whether of male or**

---

**female, to be lost. The one of you is the issue of the other." (Q. 3:195) Rodwell.**

"Mankind fear your Lord, who created you of a single soul, and from it created its mate." (Q. 4:1) Arberry

So while the Qur'an holds the works of men and women in equal regard and acknowledges that they are completely interdependent as to their very existence, they are not regarded as having equal worth as people. The men are a step above the women and superior to them as is clear from the following two verses.

**"And it is for the women to act as they (the husbands) act by them, in all fairness; but the men are a step above them."[7] (Q. 2:228) Rodwell "Men have authority over women because Allah has made the one superior to the other."(Q. 4:34) Dawood.**

The famous commentator Ibn Kathir commented on (Q. 4:34) saying:

**"Men are superior to women, and a man is better than a woman."[8]**

Other commentators such as Razi, Baidawi, Zamakhshari, and Tabari are of the same opinion.



---

Razi, commenting on Q. 4:11, said:

**"(The males share is that of two females). Man is more perfect than the woman in creation, and intelligence, and in the religious sphere, such as the suitability to be a judge, and a leader in worship. Also, the testimony of the man is twice that of the woman. So that whoever is given great responsibilities must be given correspondingly great privileges. As the woman is deficient in intelligence and of great lust, if she is given much money, much corruption will be the result. "[9]**

He also added:

**"The male is mentioned first in Q. 4:11 because the male is better than the female."[10]**

This superiority according to Razi is due to mens natural superiority in "knowledge and power, and because the man gives his wife the dowry and spends on her."[11]

A modern writer said about the previous verse:

**"God established the superiority of men over women by the above verse (the Qur'an 4:34) which prevents the equating of men and women. For here man is above the**

---

**woman due to his intellectual superiority and his ability to administer and spend on the woman."**[12]

## WOMEN'S DEFICIENCIES

### 1. WOMEN ARE DEFICIENT IN INTELLIGENCE AND RELIGION

The intellectual and religious deficiencies of women are stated in the following Hadith found in Sahih al-Bukhari which is considered by Muslim scholars to be "The most authentic book after the Book of Allah (ie. the Qur'an)":[13]

**"Allah's Apostle once said to a group of women : 'I have not seen any one more deficient in intelligence and religion than you. A cautious, sensible man could be led astray by some of you.' The women asked: 'O Allah's Apostle, what is deficient in our intelligence and religion?' He said: 'Is not the evidence of two women equal to the witness of one man?' They replied in the affirmative. He said: 'This is the deficiency of your intelligence' ... 'Isn't it true that a woman can neither pray nor fast during her menses?' The women replied in the affirmative. He said: 'This is the deficiency in your religion.'"**[14]

The authenticity of the above Hadith is undisputed. It is reported by the two most reliable collections of Hadith; Bukhari and Muslim. The agreement of Bukhari and Muslim

---

on its authenticity makes it (mutafaqun 'alayhi) 'agreed upon', which is the highest degree of authenticity. The above Hadith has been accepted and used by eminent scholars, such as Ghazali, Ibn al-'Arabi, Razi, Suyouti, Qortobi, Nawawi, and Ibn Kathir, in their writings.

The above Hadith does not describe women only in early Islam, but it is a description for all times, so long as 'women can neither pray nor fast during their menses' and so long as 'the evidence of two women is equal to the witness of one man.' This reasoning is not a temporary one, but is rooted in and derived from the Qur'an for all time until the day of resurrection.

Commenting on the Qur'anic verse Q. 30:21 which states "And of His signs is that He created for you, of yourselves, spouses, that you may repose in them" Razi said:

**"His saying 'created for you' is a proof that women were created like animals and plants and other useful things, just as the Most High has said 'He created for you what is on earth' and that necessitates the woman not to be created for worship and carrying the Divine commands. We say creating the women is one of the graces bestowed upon us and charging them with Divine commands to complete the graces bestowed upon us, not that they are charged as we men are charged. For women are not charged with many**

---

commands as we are charged, because the woman is weak, silly, in one sense she is like a child, and no commands are laid upon a child, but for the grace of Allah upon us to be complete, women had to be charged so that they may fear the torment of punishment and so follow her husband, and keep away from what is forbidden, otherwise corruption would be rampant."[15]

Another eminent Muslim thinker, Hadi Sabzevari, in his commentary on Sadr al-Mote'aliyin wrote:

That Sadr ad-Deen Shirazi classifies women as animals is a delicate allusion to the fact that women, due to the deficiency in their intelligence and understanding of intricacies, and due to their fondness of the adornments of the world, are truly and justly among the mute animals [al-haywanti al-sa<sup>^</sup>mita]. They have the nature of beasts [ad-dawwa<sup>^</sup>b], but they have been given the disguise of human beings so that men would not be loath to talk to them and be compelled to have sexual intercourse with them. That is why our immaculate Law [shar'ina al-mutahhar] takes men's side and gives them superiority in most matters, including divorce, "nushuz," etc. (Quoted in Soroush, Abdolkarim, \_Farbehtar az ideoloji\_, Sera<sup>^</sup>t, Tehran, 1373 A.H.S.). [A.H.S. = After the Hegira, in Solar years].

---

The above is consistent with the authentic Hadith that says women are deficient in intelligence and religion. This belief has been accepted by Muslim scholars and writers for the past thirteen hundred years.

**One modern writer said: "The woman's share of intellect does not reach man's level." [16]**

He then went on to say that "al-'Aqad, one of the most eminent Arabic writers, in his book al-Mar'ah wal-Qur'an,

**"has a valuable chapter in which 'Aqad demolished the intellectual equality of women and men." [17]**

As a matter of fact the expression "naqisatan 'aqlan wa dinan" (deficient in intelligence and religion) is one of the bywords and axioms of life on the lips of the masses in Arabic countries.

## 2. WOMEN ARE DEFICIENT IN GRATITUDE

Women are not only deficient in intelligence, but they also lack gratitude. Women's lack of gratitude is expressed in another Hadith from Bukhari:

**"Women are ungrateful to their husbands and are ungrateful for the favours and the good (charitable) deeds done to them. If you have always been good (benevolent) to one of them and then she sees something in you (not of**

---

**her liking), she will say, 'I have never received any good from you.'[18]**

So according to this Hadith, women are not only intellectually and spiritually deficient but also deficient in gratitude.

### **3. WOMEN ARE DEFICIENT AS WITNESSES**

The testimony of the woman is not equal to that of the man. Her testimony is half the testimony of the man with regard to financial matters. The Qur'an states,

**"And call in to witness two witnesses, men; or if the two be not men, then one man and two women, such witness as you approve of, that if one woman errs the other will remind her."[19]**

An educated Muslim woman in trying to explain why the testimony of the woman is half that of the man said,

**'Woman was made to bear and feed children. Therefore she is very emotional. And she is forgetful, because if she did not forget how it is to give birth she would not have another child. That is why she will not be as reliable a witness as a man.'[20]**

---

Therefore in Islam, the woman is perceived as being deficient in three important areas: to others due to her denial of man's kindness; to herself, due to her inadequate intelligence; and in relation to God, due to her inadequacy in religion.

WHAT IS A WOMAN ?

THE WOMAN IS A TOY

The previously mentioned deficiencies show the woman's inadequacy as a companion for man. Her deficiency in intelligence and religion prevent her from exchanging secular or sacred ideas or participating in religious or related spheres. To what level do these deficiencies reduce the woman?

**"Omar [one of the Khalifs] was once talking when his wife interjected, so he said to her: 'You are a toy, if you are needed we will call you.'"[21]**

And 'Amru Bin al-'Aas, also a Khalif, said: "Women are toys, so choose."[22]

This was not just 'Amru Bin al-'Aas and 'Omar's opinions. Mohammad himself said:

**'The woman is a toy, whoever takes her let him care for her (or do not lose her).'[23]**

---

The belief that a woman is a toy is of vital importance for the spiritual well being of a man. For according to the great philosopher Ghazali

**"In the company of women, looking at them, and playing with them, the soul is refreshed, the heart is rested, and the man is strengthened to the worship of God...this is why God said: 'That he might rest in her.' (Q. 7:189)"[24]**

#### THE WOMAN IS 'AWRAH

Apart from the deficiencies of the woman, she is also has ten 'awrat. The Encyclopedia of Islam defines 'awrah as pudendum, that is "the external genitals, especially of the female. [Latin pudendum (literally) a thing to be ashamed of]"[25]

**"Ali reported the Prophet saying: 'Women have ten ('awrat). When she gets married, the husband covers one, and when she dies the grave covers the ten.'"[26]**

And according to the following Hadith, women not only have ten 'awrat, but the woman herself is perceived as 'awrah :

**"The woman is 'awrah. When she goes outside (the house), the devil welcomes her."[27]**



---

(This Hadith is classed as 'Sahih' that is sound or faultless.) So going outside the house is a form of exposure of the 'awrah; a thing that delights the devil.

This is why women are discouraged from going outside the house, even to pray in the mosque, as the following Hadith indicates.

**"A woman is closest to God's face, if she is found in the core of her house. And the prayer of the woman in the house is better than her prayer in the mosque."[28]**

(This Hadith is classed as 'Hassan', that is approved.)

Dr. Buti a modern scholar said, "Muslim teachers unanimously agreed in every generation that the woman should cover all her body except her hands and face, that is without any make up, from strangers."[29] While the followers of Hanbal and some followers of Shafi'i consider even the hand and the face to be 'awrah, and therefore should be covered.[30]

**"And those who allow the woman to show her hand and face -the Malikiyah and Hanafiyah- do so with the provision that make up will not be used, but if the woman's face is naturally beautiful, then she must cover her face for fear of being a temptation to men."[31]**

---

Dr. Buti gives the reason behind the wearing of the Hijab.

**"Allah, the most high, decreed that the woman should be veiled. He did so in protecting the chastity of the men who might see her, and not in protection of the chastity of the woman from the eyes of those who look at her." [32]**

### THE WOMAN IS LIKE A RIB

The character of women is likened to a rib, crooked. Bukhari reported the following Hadith:

**"The woman is like a rib; if you try to straighten her, she will break. So if you want to get benefit from her, do so while she still has some crookedness." [33]** This Hadith is classed as agreed upon.

Another Hadith attributes this crookedness to the act of creation because the woman was created from man's rib.[34] This crookedness then is inherent and incurable, the man has to live with it and make the most out of it. This belief is accepted not only by the masses but by celebrated scholars such as Imam Shafi'i who said :

**'three [persons] if you esteem them they will dishonour you and if you dishonour them they will esteem you : the woman, the servant and the Nabatea.' [35]**

---

and Ghazali who said:

**"If you relax the woman's bridle a tiny bit, she will take you and bolt wildly. And if you lower her cheek-piece a hand span, she will pull you an arm's length ... Their deception is awesome and their wickedness is contagious; bad character and feeble mind are their predominant traits ... Mohammad said[36] : 'The likeness of a virtuous woman amongst women is like a red beaked crow among a hundred crows.'[37]**

Thus it is believed that virtuous women are rare and their crookedness is as natural as the crooked rib.

In spite of all these deficiencies Ghazali found some redeeming features in women: "[A man's wife] fears him, while he fears her not, a kind word from him satisfies her, where nothing of hers has importance in his eyes, it is she who must tolerate the presence of concubines, and it is she who worries when he is ill whereas even her death would leave him indifferent."[37a]

## HUSBAND'S RIGHTS

### 1. HUSBAND'S DESIRES MUST BE MET AT ONCE

Man's sexual needs are considered so urgent that it is better for food to burn in the oven than a man to burn in waiting

---

for his wife to satisfy his desire. If she refuses, the angels of heaven will turn against her.

**"The prophet of Allah said: When a man calls his wife to satisfy his desire, let her come to him though she is occupied at the oven."[38]**

(The above Hadith is agreed upon, that is, no scholar doubts its authenticity.)

**"The messenger of Allah said: Whenever a man calls his wife to his bed and she refuses, and then he passes the night in an angry mood, the angels curse her till she gets up at dawn."[39]**

The understanding that man's sexual needs are more important than the woman's was not only believed by the early Muslims, but is also believed by modern-day Muslims. A contemporary scholar wrote:

**"Allah the most high has fashioned the woman's psychological and physiological make up in such a way that man's pleasures are satisfied in her more than her pleasures satisfied in him. Not only that but she also finds her happiness in feeling so."[40]**

Another contemporary scholar wrote:

---

**"Sexual intercourse is an action, and the woman does not act."[41]**

The famous commentator Qortobi said:

**"The woman was created so that man can rest in her ... for by her he gets rid of his sexual storm. The female sexual organ was created for men. For when Allah the most high said '(You) leave what your Lord has created for you of your wives?'[42] Allah made it known that that place of the woman was created from man for man's sake. So the woman must yield it whenever the husband calls her. If she refuses then she is an oppressor and in a grave position. Sufficient proof of this was reported from Sahih Muslim in the Hadith that says 'When a man calls his wife to his bed, and she refuses, the One Who is in the heaven will be angry with her until he [her husband] is pleased with her'[43]**

## **2. OBEDIENCE TO THE HUSBAND IS THE KEY TO PARADISE**

All the woman's piety is considered useless if she disobeys her husband. Her disobedience to her husband represents an unlawful and irrational act. But obedience to her husband is the key to Paradise as is clear from the following Hadith:

**"There are three (persons) whose prayer will not be accepted, nor their virtues be taken above: The runaway**

---

**slave until he returns back to his master, the woman with whom her husband is dissatisfied, and the drunk until he becomes sober."**[44]

"Whosoever female dies while her husband is pleased with her, will enter Paradise."[45]

"The prophet once said to a woman: 'Watch how you treat your husband for he is your Paradise and your Hell.'"[46]

### 3. HUSBAND'S RIGHTS ARE DIVINE

The obedience of the woman to her husband is an important prerequisite that shows her piety and guarantees her eternal destiny. He is her Paradise or her hell. Man is thus so elevated that by comparison with the woman, he is placed on a divine level. Her response to him approaches worship. That however, is impossible, as worship belongs to God alone.

Mohammad said:

**"Had I ordered anybody to prostrate before any one, I would have ordered women to prostrate before their husbands on account of men's rights over the women ordained by Allah."**[47]

### 4. HUSBAND'S RIGHTS ARE GREATER THAN THE SACRIFICE OF WOMAN'S BREASTS

---

Man's status is so much higher than woman's that no sacrifice on the woman's part will ever gain her her full right in relation to a man. Even in our own time (1985) a Muslim writer, Ahmad Zaky Tuffaha, seriously and reverently quotes the following Hadith :

**"If a woman offered one of her breasts to be cooked and the other to be roasted, she still will fall short of fulfilling her obligations to her husband. And besides that if she disobeys her husband even for a twinkling of an eye, she would be thrown in the lowest part of Hell, except she repents and turns back." [48]**

Although this Hadith is not mentioned in Bukhari, it is consistent with the other Ahadith quoted by Bukhari.

It is a noble sacrifice for a man to share his life with the woman as described in Bukhari's sound Ahadith; she being deficient in mind, religion, and gratitude. It is condescension on the part of the man to spend his life with her. She can not repay this favour, no matter what sacrifice she makes.

Indeed, the rights of the husband are so vast that

**"If blood, suppuration, and pus, were to pour from the husband's nose and the wife licked it with her tongue, she would still never be able to fulfil his rights over her." [49]**

---

This Hadith is repeated, also with great reverence, five times by commentator Imam Suyuti who is regarded as one of the greatest of all Muslim scholars.

## WOMAN'S RIGHTS

While the Hadith enumerates the husband's rights, the woman's rights are simple, as the following Hadith shows:

**"O Messenger of Allah ! What right has the wife of one among us got over him?' He said: 'It is that you shall give her food when you have taken your food, that you shall clothe her when you have clothed yourself, that you shall not slap her on the face, nor revile her, nor desert her except within the house.'"[50]**

## MAN'S PREROGATIVES

### 1. MAN MAY BEAT AND SEXUALLY DESERT HIS WIFE

The Qur'an describes the natural relationship between the husband and the wife as one of love and mercy: "He has set between you love (mawaddah) and mercy." Q. 30:21. A contemporary scholar, Sayyed Qotb sees that the love and the mercy spoken of in this verse as the natural feelings the man has for the opposite sex that was planted by the creator. Earlier scholars saw that "love" between the husband and the wife in the above verse refers to the sexual



---

act, while "mercy" refers to the offspring of the man and his wife.[51] The important thing to note is that this love and mercy is not found in the man apart from the woman, but it is a mutual thing found in both. And the Qur'an commands men to "Consort with them (women) in kindness (ma'ruf)." Q. 4:19 According to the Dictionary of Qur'anic terms and concepts the word "ma'ruf" means "customary law; enjoining good and forbidding evil." [52]

Elsewhere the word is translated many times as equitable as in Yusuf Ali's English translation of the Qur'an.[53] In other words when women behave properly they are to be treated kindly, the treatment must be equitable according to the customary laws.

There is also a Hadith that describes the good husband; "The best of you are those who are the best to their wives." [54] (that Hadith is mentioned only by Tirmizi). But how far this goodness will go in difficult times, when the wife does not behave properly?

The man according to the Qur'an has the responsibility to admonish his wife, and the right to desert her sexually, and to beat her to correct any rebelliousness in her behaviour.

The Qur'an states:

---

**"Righteous women are therefore obedient, ... And those you fear may be rebellious (nushuz) admonish; banish them to their couches, and beat them."[55]**

Some translators add the word lightly after 'beat them'[56] in Q. 4:34. Others like Mohammed Pickthall and Rodwell translate the word 'edrebouhon - beat them' as 'scourge them'.

The occasion in which Q. 4:34 was revealed sheds more light on the meaning of that verse. Most commentators mention that

**"the above verse was revealed in connection with a woman who complained to Mohammad that her husband slapped her on the face (which was still marked by the slap). At first the Prophet said to her: 'Get even with him', but then added: 'Wait until I think about it.' Later on the above verse was revealed, after which the Prophet said: 'We wanted one thing but Allah wanted another, and what Allah wanted is best.'"[57]**

The beating in the previous incident can hardly be described as light, unless that is what is meant by light beating. This beating comes as the last corrective measure when sexual desertion fails. Light beating after sexual desertion is an anticlimax that serves no purpose. But firm beating is the

---

logical progression from admonishing, then sexually deserting, finally beating her. This beating must be stronger than sexual desertion to have any effect.

This beating however is not like the whipping of a slave,[58] but "a beating without causing injury"[59] (agreed upon).

So the man has the right to beat his rebellious wife as long as that beating is not like the whipping of the slave and will not result in injury.

The translator of Mishkat Al-Masabih wrote in a footnote of Fatwa by Qazi Khan that said beating the wife mildly is

**"allowed in four cases (1) When she does not wear fineries though wanted by the husband, (2) When she is called for sexual intercourse and she refuses without any lawful excuse, (3) When she is ordered to take a bath [to clean herself] from impurities for prayer and she refuses and (4) When she goes abroad without permission of her husband."**[60]

In another footnote the translator of Mishkat Al-Masabih said,

**"No wife shall refuse her husband what he wants from her except on religious grounds ie. at the time of menstrual flow or fasting. Some theologians regard this refusal as**

---

**unlawful as the husband may get enjoyment from his wife in other ways, by embracing, kissing etc. The duty of the wife is to give him comforts in his bed whenever he wants her."[61] (emphasis added)**

This beating is the husband's unquestionable right.

Ibn Kathir in his commentary mentioned a Hadith on the authority of zal Ash'ath Ibn al-Qays who was visiting 'Omar and at that time. 'Omar took his wife and beat her, then said to Ash'ath:

**'Memorise three things from me, which I memorised from the prophet who said: "The man is not to be asked why he beat his wife ..."'[62]**

Man's right to 'beat his wife' does not belong to the distant past. The Guardian Weekly reported,

**"In 1987 an Egyptian court, following an interpretation of the Koran proposed by the Syndicate of Arab Lawyers, ruled that a husband had the duty to educate his wife and therefore the right to punish her as he wished."[63]**

Sayyed Qotb a modern scholar and commentator tries to justify the provision for a man to beat his wife, found in the above Qur'anic verse:

---

**"The facts of life, and the psychological observations of certain forms of deviations indicate that this approach (beating the wife) is the most appropriate one to satisfy a particular form of deviation, reforming the behaviour of the person ... and gratifying her ... at the same time!**

Even without the existence of this form of psychological deviation, perhaps some women will not recognise the power of the man whom they love to have as their guardian and husband, except when the man conquers them physically! This is not the nature of every woman. But this kind does exist. And it is this kind that needs this last treatment to be set straight, and remain within the serious organisation [marriage] in peace and tranquillity."[64]

Some intellectuals, referring to the above quotation, said:

**"Women's rebelliousness (nushuz) is a medical condition. It is of two kinds: The first is the condition when the woman delights to be the submissive partner who finds pleasure in being beaten and tortured. This is what is called Masochism. The second is when the woman loves to hurt and master and dominate the other partner. This is what is called Sadism. Such woman has no remedy except removing her spikes and destroying her weapon by which she dominates. This weapon of the woman is her**

---

**femininity. But the other woman who delights in submission and being beaten, then beating is her remedy. So the Qur'anic command: 'banish them to their couches, and beat them' agrees with the latest psychological findings in understanding the rebellious woman. This is one of the scientific miracles of the Qur'an because it sums up volumes of the science of psychology about rebellious women."**[65]

The above two quotations state that the Qur'anic injunction to beat the perverted masochist woman will cure her from her disorder. But will it rather increase her perversion by giving her the pleasure she sought? Will giving alcohol to the alcoholic be his remedy too? And why beat the sadist wife? Why not let her have her own way too, like the masochistic one? Why not let her beat and torture others?

Even if this treatment is of benefit to the minority of women who are perverted, does this justify the command to beat the wife who rebels for any and every reason?

Whether or not the beating of wives is justified, this is the man's right, and his alone.

The man who fears rebelliousness in his wife must admonish her first. If that does not work, the husband has the right to

---

desert her sexually. If that does not work either, he has the right to beat her.

Sayyed Qotb explains the dynamics of deserting the wife sexually if admonishing her does not work:

**"Here comes the second phase ... the man has to make a superior psychological move against all her attraction and beauty, by banishing her to her couch, for the couch (the bed) is the place of temptation and enticement, where the rebellious woman reaches the summit of her power. If the man can conquer his disposition against her temptation, then he has disarmed her from her sharpest and most treasured weapon." [66]**

Another scholar reiterating the above said:

**"This sexual desertion is a remedy that curbs the rebelliousness of the woman, and humiliates her pride, in that which she treasures most, her femininity ... thus inflicting the most humiliating defeat on the woman. " [67]**

The man then has the right to desert his wife sexually and beat her, if he fears rebelliousness in her.

The woman, however, can not resort to such measures, if she fears rebelliousness in her husband, as is clear from the following verse:

---

**"If a woman fears rebelliousness or aversion in her husband, there is no fault in them if the couple set things right between them; right settlement is better." [68]**

It is clear from Q. 4:128 & Q. 4:34 that the Qur'an commands diplomacy when a woman fears rebelliousness in her husband. But when the man fears rebelliousness in his wife, the Qur'an commands the use of force and sexual desertion.

Bukhari gives an example of the wife's options if she fears cruelty or desertion on her husband's part in the following Hadith:

"... narrated 'Aisha (regarding the verse:- 'If a wife fears cruelty or desertion on her husband's part...) It concerns the woman whose husband does not want to keep her with him any longer, but wants to divorce her and marry some other lady, so she says to him: 'Keep me and do not divorce me, and then marry another woman, and you may neither spend on me, nor sleep with me.' This is indicated by the statement of Allah:- 'There is no blame on them if they arrange an amicable settlement between them both, and such settlement is better.'" [69] (emphasis added)

So according to Bukhari's sound Hadith, the recommended amicable settlement for the woman who fears cruelty or desertion on her husband's part, is to submit to her



---

husband's will to marry another woman, and to forego her financial and sexual rights.

Beating the rebellious wife is the last resort before divorcing her. She must be admonished first. If that does not work, the husband has the right to desert her sexually. The Qur'anic injunction to consort with women kindly is not inconsistent with beating the rebellious wife and sexually deserting her, this beating is included and part of the scope of the kind treatment. The prophet himself, who was the kindest of all Muslims to his wives, deserted them all sexually for one month.[70] Imam Ghazali puts it this way: "There is wickedness and weakness in women. Diplomacy and harshness is the remedy of wickedness, kindness and gentleness is the remedy of weakness." [71]

In contrast to the way a husband can treat his wife, in Islam children are required to treat their mothers with utmost respect according to the following two Hadiths:

**Abu Hurairah reported that a man came to the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) and asked: "O Messenger of Allah, who is the person who has the greatest right on me with regards to kindness and attention?" He replied, "Your mother." "Then who?" He replied, "Your mother." "Then who?" He replied, "Your mother." "Then who?" He replied, "Your father."**

---

And

**"Paradise is under the feet of mothers."**

Dr. Suhaib Hasan comments on the latter:

**The [above] hadith with this wording is da'if, but its meaning is contained in the hadith of Ibn Majah and al-Nasa'i that a man came to the Prophet (may Allah bless him and grant him peace) and said, "O Messenger of Allah! I intend to go on a (military) expedition, but I have come to ask your advice." He said, "Is your mother alive?" He said, "Yes." He said, "Then stay with her, for the Garden is under her feet." [71a]**

It is a fact that some mothers deserve the lowest place in hell. It is logical then that Paradise is not under the feet of every mother. The statement "the Garden is under her feet" was said in regard to a particular woman, who probably was known to Mohammad for her uprightness.

Furthermore, the fact that Muhammad did not command every one of his fighting men to stay at home if their mothers were still alive makes it clear that this was not a general principle but referred to a specific woman who possibly was old and in need of the care of her (only?) son.

---

Even if that Hadith is sahih, it must be noted that both hadiths do focus on mothers in particular, not women in general. Both Hadiths exclude wives who have no children and of course single women.

It must be noted also that both Hadith regulate the specific relationship between children and mothers, not the relationship between husband and wife. So while a son is required to give his mother the utmost respect, the husband of this mother still has the right to desert her, and beat her if he "fears rebelliousness" on her part.

Some other Hadiths that are often quoted in order to counterbalance the many Hadiths that enumerate men's rights are the following:

**The best of you is he who is best to his wife.[71b]**

The best of you are those who are best to their ahl, meaning spouses and children. And I am the best of you to my family.[71c]

These Hadiths must be viewed in the light of the facts of history. It is a fact that "Mohammad deserted his wives for a whole month."[71d] At one occasion he also called both Aisha and Hafsa "the Companions of Joseph" which is a very derogatory term.[71e] He also intended to divorce Sawda for no reason except that she became old (Ibn Kathir commenting on Q. 4:128). Mohammad's superiority as a

---

husband did not prevent him from exercising his rights as a Muslim man.

## 2. MEN MAY MARRY UP TO FOUR FREE WOMEN AND HAVE SEX WITH AN UNLIMITED NUMBER OF SLAVE GIRLS

A provision is made for men to marry more than one woman as follows:

**"If you fear you can not treat orphans (girls) with fairness, then you may marry other women who seem good to you: two, three or four of them. But if you fear that you can not maintain equality among them, marry only one or any slave girls you may own. This will make it easier for you to avoid injustice."[72]**

Some however have argued that since maintaining equality is impossible, then marrying more than one wife is not permissible using the following verse:

**"Try as you may, you cannot treat all your wives impartially. Do not set yourself altogether against any of them."[73]**

But the majority of the commentators agreed that

**The equality in Q. 4:3 is concerned with apportioning time and money, while the equality mentioned in Q. 4:129 is**

---

**concerned with the affection and love of the man towards his wives.[74]**

They further argued that Mohammad himself was not impartial in his affections towards his wives, for he loved 'A'isha more than any of his wives.[75] So as long as the husband can be fair in apportioning his time and money he can marry up to four.

Others believe the number is limited to nine wives, as two and three and four make nine, and Mohammad himself when he passed away had nine wives, and to follow his tradition is the commended way of living.[76]

Others believe that the above verse is the proof for an unlimited number of wives, because the verse does not say two or three or four but literally says two and three and four, meaning two and three and four etc.[77] The majority believe the number of wives the man may marry to be limited to four, because of the reported Hadith about a man who had ten wives. When he became a Muslim, Mohammad said to him : 'Keep four, and leave the rest.'[78]

The reason for marrying more than one woman is given by Ghazali the great Muslim scholar:

**"Some men have such a compelling sexual desire that one woman is not sufficient to protect them [from adultery]."**

---

**Such men therefore preferably marry more than one woman and may have up to four wives."**[79]

Besides the above provision men have the right to have sex with their slave girls.

**"For if a man purchases a slave girl, the purchase contract includes his right to have sex with her."**[80] **"This contract is primarily to own her and secondarily to enjoy her sexually."**[81]

And the reason for having sex with the slave girls beside one's wives is also given by Ghazali:

**"Since among Arabs passion is an overpowering aspect of their nature, the need of their pious men to have sex has been found to be the more intense. And for the purpose of emptying the heart to the worship of God they have been allowed to have sex with women slaves if at some time they should fear that this passion will lead them to commit adultery. Though it is true that such action could lead to the birth of a child that will be a slave, which is a form of destruction,...yet enslaving a child is a lighter offence than the destruction of religious belief. For enslaving the new born is a temporary thing but by committing adultery eternity is lost."**[82]

---

Ghazali gives us an example of this overpowering sexual desire.

**"The son of 'Omar who was an ascetic, and a scholar, used to break his fast by having sex before having food. And he might have had sex with three of his slave girls before the last meal."[83]**

And Bukhari reported,

**"The Prophet used to pass (have sexual relation with) all his wives in one night, and at that time he had nine wives."[84]**

For

"He once said of himself that he had been given the power of forty men in sex."[85]

And

"Ali who was the most ascetic of all the companions had four wives, and seventeen slave girls as concubines."[86]

While

"some of the other companions had three and four wives and those who had two wives were countless in number."[87]

---

Concerning the provision for having sex with slave girls, found in the last part of the above Qur'anic verse, Razi said:

**"God made the provision of having sex with many slave girls as easy as marrying one free woman. Besides, the responsibilities and provisions of the slave girls are lighter than those of the dowers, no matter (never mind) if you have a few of them or many, no matter if you were fair in apportioning your nights amongst them or not, no matter whether you completed the sexual act or not." [88]**

The commentator Qortobi sees in that verse (Q. 4:3) that slave girls used as such by the free Muslim man

**"have neither sexual rights, nor financial rights. For God made the 'one free woman' and the 'slave girls you may own' of the same category. The man however owes the slave girls the appropriate rights of ownership, and the kindness that befits slaves." [89]**

So because "the need of the pious men to have sex was found to be the more intense, and for the purpose of emptying the heart for the worship of God" they have been allowed to marry up to four women and have sex with an unlimited number of slave girls even if this provision may lead to "the birth of a child that will be a slave, which is a form of destruction."



---

### 3. MAN'S RIGHT TO DIVORCE HIS WIFE

Divorce is recognized by most societies as a horrible thing. It is viewed as such in Islam except that it is viewed as a lawful course of action. The Hadith states, "The most detestable of lawful things near Allah is divorce." [90]

The power to divorce usually resides in the hand of the man. Bukhari reported a Hadith that shows how easy the detestable and lawful act can be.

**A "man may say to his brother (in Islam), 'Have a look at either of my wives (and if you wish), I will divorce her for you.' "[91]**

It can even happen against the will, and the love of the husband and the wife concerned.

**"The son of 'Omar reported: I had a wife under me whom I loved but whom 'Omar disliked. He told me: 'Divorce her'. But I refused. Then 'Omar came to the Messenger of Allah and notified it to him. The messenger of Allah told me: 'Divorce her'." [92] (Quoted by Tirmizi and Abu Daud)**

### 4. MAN'S PRIVILEGES IN THE CUSTODY OF CHILDREN

Man is the privileged party in cases of custody of the children. Gaziri a modern scholar in Islamic Law wrote:

---

The Hanafites, who form the largest Muslim group, said "The conditions of the custody of the children is as follows. First the wife should not reject Islam. If she rejects Islam, she has no right to the custody of the children. Second, she must be of good character for if it was proven that she is corrupted by illicit sex, or theft, or has a low trade such as a professional mourner, or a dancer, she loses her right to custody. Third, she is not allowed to marry anyone except the father of the child. If she remarries, she has no right to custody, unless her new husband is related to the child as a paternal uncle. But if she marries a foreigner she has no right to custody. Fourthly, she must not leave the child without supervision. Especially if the child is a female, because females need protection. So if the mother had to go outside for a long period and so neglect her child, she has no right to the custody of the child. Fifthly, if the father is poor, and the mother refused the custody of the child except for payment, and his aunty said 'I will look after him for free', then the aunt will have the right to the custody of the child. To follow the religion of Islam is not a condition to the right to custody, for if the husband is married to one of the people of the Book, she has the right to custody as long as he is safe from apostasy, or corruption. But if that is

---

not so, such as he saw her taking the child to a church, or feeding him pigs meat, or giving him wine, then the father has the right to take the child from her, and sanity is a prerequisite that is agreed upon by all."[93]

As to the period of custody, Gazirir added

"the Hanafites said, the mother has the rights to the custody of the boy until he is seven years old. Others said "Until he is nine". But the first opinion is the one that is legally accepted. For the girl there are two opinions. The first until she menstruates. The second until she reaches the age of puberty which was set to be nine years old. This is what is accepted legally."[94]

The mother can have the child for the most difficult years where she wakes up at night to feed and change nappies and toilet train etc. then the father can take over when the child is capable of being a help instead of needing help.

## 5. MEN IN PARADISE WILL ENJOY SEX WITH PERPETUALLY EXQUISITE VIRGIN WOMEN.

Muslim men are entitled to several wives in this life. In Paradise, they are further rewarded with additional women - perfect in beauty.

Mu'az reported from the messenger of Allah who said:

---

**"A woman does not give trouble to her husband in this world but his wife of the pure-eyed virgin ones [huris] does not say to her: 'Do not give him trouble. May Allah destroy you, He is only a passing guest with you and it is very near that he will soon leave you to come to us'." [95]**

The editor of Mishkat wrote in a footnote to that tradition:

**"No woman should give trouble and anxiety to her husband. She is to give him ease and comfort in the household. If she acts otherwise, she will not be able to be his mate in Paradise. There the pure-eyed virgin girls will be his consorts."**

For the Qur'an promises godfearing men, beautiful women in Paradise. The following are their descriptions:

**"Lo! those [men] who kept their duty will be in a place secure amid gardens and water springs, attired in silk and silk embroidery, facing one another. Even so (it will be). And We shall wed them unto [huris] fair ones with wide, lovely eyes." [96]**

**"Therein maidens restraining their glances, untouched before them by any man or jinn .....lovely as rubies, beautiful as coral" [97]**

---

"The fair, the beautiful ones [huris]... With large dark eyeballs, kept close in their pavilions"[98]

"Surely for the godfearing awaits a place of security, gardens and vineyards, and maidens of swelling breasts (Kawa'eb)[99], like of age, and a cup overflowing."[100]

From this, it can be seen that the godfearing shall be 'wedded' to women in Paradise. Those women will not look at any one else, except their husbands. They will be restrained in their pavilions. Those women in Paradise will be fair; not like the dark skinned ones of Arabia. Their beauty will be perfect. Their eyes are wide and large, and their breasts are

**"Kawa'eb" -"swelling and firm, not sagging."[101]**

The Hadith also tells us-

**"In Paradise ... every person would have two wives (so beautiful) that the marrow of their shanks would glimmer beneath the flesh and there would be none without a wife in Paradise."[102]**

Another Hadith makes the number of wives seventy two. Seventy females are specially created, and two are human females.[103] His earthly wife may be included among his "huris", but in Paradise there will be additional women for him, even up to seventy-two.

---

The above descriptions are literal, and the relationship between men and their "huris" are physical, and not only spiritual as the following Hadith which is chosen by the compiler of Mishkat al- Masabih shows.

**"The Holy Prophet said: 'The believer will be given such and such strength in Paradise for sexual intercourse. It was questioned: O prophet of Allah! can he do that? He said: 'He will be given the strength of one hundred persons.'"[104]**

(This Hadith is Quoted from Tirmizi and classed by Tirmizi as Sahih - sound and faultless."[105]

Ibn Kathir in his commentary emphasises the literal nature of sexual intercourse in Paradise by another Hadith:

**"The Prophet was asked : 'Do we have sex in Paradise?' He answered: 'Yes, by him who holds my soul in his hand, and it will be done dahman, dahman (that is intercourse done with such shove and disturbance[106]). And when it is finished she will return pure and virgin again.'"[107]**

In Islam, the perpetual taking of the virginity of women is traditionally associated with Paradise. The famous commentary Al-Jalalayn sees that the rejoicing mentioned in

---

the Qur'anic verse "The inhabitants of Paradise today are busy in their rejoicing (fakehoun)"[108]

**"includes the taking of the virginity of women in Paradise."[109]**

The great scholar Ghazali quotes al-'Ouaza'i, one of the early scholars who commented on the above verse saying: "'Busy in their rejoicing' means busy taking the virginity of the virgins."[110]

**And the great commentator Ibn 'Abbas said of the above verse: (fakehoun) means enjoying taking the virginity of the virgins."[111]**

Not only on earth, but also in Paradise, the man has considerable sexual enjoyments. He may marry several women on earth, and even when his earthly life is over, he may look forward to having beautiful women in Paradise. He will be able to have up to seventy-two "huris"; he will be given the strength of one hundred men in sex; he will be able to perform sex with great shoving and disturbance, on the other hand, nothing is promised to the woman. She has no assurance of even one man.

Once again, the man has all the advantages and pleasures, while the woman must be perpetually used for his purposes.

---

His is the pleasure - hers the disturbance, in this world and the next.

## THE REASON WHY

Why do men in Islam have such privileges over women? The following material, taken mostly from a contemporary work on Islamic Law by a modern scholar named Gaziri, may explain the reason why.

## THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MARRIAGE CONTRACT

**"The marriage contract is designed by the legislator so that the husband may benefit from the sexual organ of the woman and the rest of her body for the purpose of pleasure. As such the husband owns by the marriage contract, this exclusive benefit." [112]**

"The accepted understanding in the different schools of jurisprudence, is that what has been contracted in marriage is for the benefit of the man from the woman, not the opposite. The followers of Imam Malik declared the marriage contract is a contract of ownership of benefit of the sexual organ of the woman and the rest of her body.

The followers of Imam Shafi'i said, "The most accepted view is that what is been contracted upon is the woman, that is the benefit derived from her sexual organ." Others said, "What has been contracted is both the man and the woman.



---

So according to the first opinion the wife can not demand sex from her husband because it is his right [not hers], and according to the second opinion she can demand to have sex with him."

The followers of Imam Abu Hanifa said, "The right of the sexual pleasure belongs to the man, not the woman, by that it is meant that the man has the right to force the woman to gratify himself sexually. She on the other hand does not have the right to force him to have sex with her except once [in a lifetime]. But he must, from a religious point of view, have sex with her to protect her from being morally corrupt."[113]

#### THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DOWRY

**"The dowry (Mahr) is a technical term denoting the money which must be given to the woman in the marriage contract in exchange for enjoying her."[114]**

"The most worthy condition you fulfil is one with which you were given the right to enjoy the (woman's) private parts."[115]

The Encyclopaedia of Islam commented on the above Hadith saying,

---

**"According to a tradition in Bukhari the mahr is an essential condition for the legality of the marriage 'Every marriage without mahr is null and void'."[116]**

The giving of the dowry is fundamental to the securing of man's sexual rights, so "Who so gives two handfuls of flour or dates as dowry of his wife has rendered [her] (private parts) lawful."[117] The Hadith recorded that a pair of shoes[118], and an iron ring[119] were given as a dowry. For "The best dowry is the easiest to pay."[120]

The connection between the dowry and sexual enjoyment can even be seen outside of marriage:

**"If a man has sex with a married woman, by mistake, thinking her to be his wife, he must give her a dowry equal to the dowry given to a woman of her social worth. This dowry becomes the property of the wife and not her husband."[121]**

This significance of the dowry as a guarantee of the man's sexual enjoyment is rooted in the Qur'an, as we shall see from the following statements made by some of the most eminent scholars:

**"(Such wives as you enjoy thereby, give them their wages apportionate. Q. 4:24) The enjoyment [mentioned in this**

---

**Qur'anic verse] is the sexual pleasure. And the wages is the dowry. And the dowry was called a wage because it is a wage of enjoyment...and that proves that the wage is an exchange of the woman's sexual organ (or the sexual intercourse), for what is given in exchange for an enjoyment is called a wage. The scholars disagreed as to what is the thing that is being contracted in the marriage contract. Is it the body of the woman , or the enjoyment that comes from the use of the woman's sexual organ? Or both? What is obvious is 'both' because the contract stipulates all of that."**[122] (Qurtubi)

This significance of the dowry is also attested to by the Hadith:

**"A man married a woman thinking her to be a virgin. He discovering she was pregnant from adultery went and reported it to the Prophet. The Prophet judged that the woman was entitled to the dowry. He separated the two, commanded that the woman be flogged, and said to the man, 'The baby will be your slave [In Islam both recognition and adoption of illegitimate children is impossible][123]. So the dowry is given in exchange for the sexual intercourse."**[124] (Ibn Kathir)

---

"The dowry is given in exchange for the woman's sexual organs." [125] (Ibn Kathir)

"By analogy the dowry is to be given in exchange for the use or the benefit of the woman's sexual organ." [126] (Razi)

"(Such wives as you enjoy thereby, give them their wages apportionate. Q. 4:24) There are two interpretations concerning that verse. The first, which is the opinion of the majority of the scholars, in His saying (Lawful for you ...is that you may seek using your wealth in wedlock). By this is meant seeking the woman by wealth through marriage. The other interpretation is that this verse speaks of temporary marriage." [127] (Razi)

"Abu Bakr ar-Razi said: 'This verse [Q. 4:24] is a proof that the freeing of the slave girl cannot be her dowry'. Because this verse proves that the woman's sexual organ is something which has a monetary value." [128]

"Malik said: The dowry shouldn't be less than a quarter of a dinar, or three dirhams. Some of our followers said in justification of his finding: This resembles most, the cutting of the hand because the woman's sexual organ is a member of the body and the hand is a member whose amputation becomes lawful for stealing a minimum amount of money. And that is a quarter of a dinar, or three dirhams. So Malik considered the woman's sexual organ as being of the same

---

worth as the hand. Abu 'Omar said: "Abu Hanifah had come to a similar conclusion before him. For he compared the dowry with the cutting of the hand. In his system, the hand cannot be cut, except in a dinar or twelve dirhams and according to him there is no dowry below that."[129] (Qurtubi)

"Allah's saying (you may seek using your wealth in wedlock) This means: through marriage or purchase. So Allah the Wise made lawful the woman's sexual organ by wealth. That necessitates the giving of dowry in marriage. The most high made unlawful the use of the woman's sexual organ except by paying something in return."[130] (Ibn al- 'Araby)

"give them their wages appportionate. (Q. 4:24) This verse proves that the dowry is called 'wages'. The evidence for that is that the dowry is given in exchange for the benefit of the sexual enjoyment. For the benefit is the opposite to what is called 'wages'."[131] (Ibn al- 'Araby)

"Our scholars have said: "Allah the most exalted, He made the dowry to be a substitute. He treated it like other things that require a substitute. Because of his saying: "(Such wives as you enjoy thereby, give them their wages appportionate. Q. 4:24) So He called it a wage. He took it outside the law of gifts to the law of replacements. The argument that both partners enjoy each other in marriage and that the dowry is an additional payment for the wife, is not so. But the

---

husband is obliged to pay the dowry, so that he may own the right of rulership over the woman, and stand as the "master to his slave" in the relationship because of what he gave as a substitute. So that her benefit becomes his. So she cannot fast except by his permission. She cannot go to pilgrimage, except by his permission. She does not leave the house, except by his permission. And he will have the right over her property except up to a third will belong to her. It goes without saying, that he will have the right over her body. "[132] (Ibn al-'Araby)

Ibn al-'Araby saw that the man's sexual rights by virtue of the paying of the dowry is grounded in the Qur'an. He even went as far as saying that the payment of the dowry provided a master-servant relationship between the husband and the wife.

## MAN HAS THE RIGHT TO PREVENT HIS WIFE FROM CARING FOR HER CHILD FROM A PREVIOUS MARRIAGE

The implications of the sexual rights secured by the payment of this dowry extend to affect children of a previous marriage:

**"The husband has the right to prevent his wife from looking after and breast feeding her baby, from her previous husband, (if she was living in the husband's house), because that will make her too busy to attend to the**

---

**husband, and it will affect her beauty and cleanliness, all these are the rights of the husband alone."**[133] (Hanafites)

## MAN HAS THE RIGHT TO REFUSE HIS WIFE'S DAILY MAINTENANCE

In Islam "marriage does not produce any community of property between husband and wife." [134] Hence the wife must rely on the support of her husband daily. However, there are numerous grounds on which the husband can refuse supporting his wife as the following indicates:

The Hanafites said :

**'The support of the woman (nafaqa) is obligatory on the man in return for the woman being locked up in the man's house, and for being exclusively his.'**[135]

"The Hanafites said : 'There is no support for the woman if she is -  
(1) Rebellious (Nashiz) that is the woman who goes outside the house of the husband without his permission and without a justifiable reason, or refuses surrendering herself to him so she does not enter his house. But if she refuses to have sex with him (even though that is unlawful) that refusal is not a reason for stopping her support because the qualifying reason for the support does exist and that is her being locked up in his house.

- 
- (2) The renegade woman.
- (3) The woman who obeys the husband's son or his father or kiss either with lust or any thing that might put her relation with her husband on a prohibited degree.
- (4) The woman whose marriage contract is imperfect, and the woman who had sex with someone by mistake, the man thinking she was his wife.
- (5) The wife who is too young to have sex. ["The Islamic law knows no minimum age for a legal marriage.[136]]
- (6) The wife who is imprisoned, even if she is innocent, if he can not have access to her (as a wife).
- (7) The sick wife who, due to severe illness, did not move after the ceremony to the husband's house, because she did not surrender herself to the husband.
- (8) The wife who was raped by another man.
- (9) The wife who goes to perform pilgrimage ... there is no support for her because she is not locked up."[137]

The followers of Imam Shafi'i said: "The conditions of the man's maintenance for the woman are as follows: First, she must avail herself to him by offering herself to him, such as saying to him 'I am surrendering myself to you'. The important thing is that she must notify him in advance that she is ready for his meeting with her, and of his entrance upon her as he wishes. If she does not notify him that she is ready, she has no right of maintenance, even if she does not refuse his request to meet with her. So maintenance is



---

conditional upon the woman's notification to her husband that she is ready for his meeting any time he wishes, and that she must avail him of herself anytime he wishes. So if she works during the day time, and he cannot meet with her, her maintenance would be denied. Secondly, she must be capable of having sexual intercourse. If she was a small girl, that cannot cope with intercourse, she is not entitled to the maintenance. Thirdly, she must not be rebellious, that is, disobeying her husband, which can take the form of preventing him from enjoying her by refusing his touch and his kisses and refusing to have sex. If she denies him any of the above, her maintenance will be cancelled for that day, because maintenance is due day by day. ... and the rebelliousness of one day cancels his provision for clothing her for a whole season." [138]

The followers of Imam Malik said: "The condition for the man's maintenance to the woman is that she should avail herself to the man for sexual intercourse, so that if he requested it from her she would not refuse. Otherwise she would have no right to the maintenance." [139]

"The followers of Imam Ibn Hanbal said, ' The wife's daily maintenance is due upon the husband if the wife surrenders herself to her husband completely ... for the daily maintenance is given to the woman in return for the husband's sexual enjoyment, so when the wife surrenders

---

herself her daily maintenance is obligatory as long as she had reached nine years old ... so if she was well physically and surrendered herself for the enjoyment of the husband but without sexual intercourse, she has no right for the daily maintenance. So if the wife refuses to surrender herself so that the husband might have sex with her, her daily maintenance is denied, so if she then has a problem that prevents her from having sex with her husband, but surrenders herself to her husband after that, her daily maintenance is not given to her as long as she is sick, as a punishment for her because she refused to surrender to her husband when she was well."[140]

The above rulings are sincerely believed to be the will of Allah. Gaziri who summarised the opinions of the different schools of Islamic law, in the introduction of his work, al-Fiqh, wrote:

**"My intention was to produce for the people a book explaining to them their responsibilities & privileges within the family. ...so that the muslim masses, recognising their duties might perform them with perfection to please the Almighty God."[141]**

## SPIRITUAL STANDING OF WOMEN

The Hadith describes the good wife as follows:

---

**"The virtuous wife, if her husband bids her, she obeys him; if he looks at her, she pleases him; if he gives her an oath; she fulfils it, and if he is absent from her, she guards herself and his property."[142] (Ibn Magah)**

"The best women are those who have the prettiest faces and the cheapest dowry."[143]

"The good wife is out of this world because she helps free you to concentrate on the life to come. She does that by doing her house duties (instead of the husband having to do them), and by satisfying the husband sexually so protecting him from sexual temptation."[144]

Although women protect man's eternal destiny, by guarding them against committing adultery, they themselves are perceived as being very dangerous to men. Ghazali reported the following Hadith:

**"When a woman comes she comes in the form of a devil."[145]**

And it is believed that the majority of them will end up in Hell.

**"The Prophet said: 'I have not left any calamity [fitnah] after me more detrimental to men than women.'"[146] (Bukhari, Agreed upon)**

---

Dr. M. al-Buti addresses Muslim Girls saying, "Know that this temptation which afflicts the man is due to you." [147] Commenting on the Qur'an 3:13 (Decked out fair to men is the love of lusts- Women, children, heaped up heaps of gold and silver, horses of mark, cattle and tillage.) Dr. Buti said:

**"God regarded woman as the first ranking lusts which He placed in the way of mankind... The woman then is absolutely the greatest affliction in a man's life." [148]**

"The prophet of Allah said to Fatima, his daughter, 'What is best for a woman?' She replied, 'That she does not see a man and not be seen by a man'. He being pleased with her answer hugged her and said, 'An offspring resembling its origin.' The companions used to block the windows and the holes in the walls of their houses, so that the women do not look to men. ... 'Omar said, 'Do not dress the women (nicely) and they will remain inside the house' for they will not go outside in tattered clothes. He also said, 'Get your women used to the word 'No'." [149]

Bukhari recorded the following Hadith:

**'O women! Give alms, as I have seen that the majority of the dwellers of Hell-fire were you (women).'" [150]**

And Muslim recorded:

---

**"Amongst the inmates of Paradise the women would form the minority."[151]**

Dr. Mohammad al-Buti, a modern writer sees that the reason the majority of women will end up in Hell is because they fail in their most important task thus causing men to stumble.[152]

Thus women represent the greatest stumbling block to men's worship and their eternal destiny as the following Hadith state:

"Had it not been for women, God would have truly, truly been worshipped."[153]

"There is no calamity I fear on my nation more than women and wine."[154]

"Men perished, the day they obeyed the women."[155]

## CONCLUSION

It is no surprise that some thinking women from Islamic background rebel against such teachings. One such woman Dr. Sa'dawi wrote:

**"The institution of marriage remained very different for men to what it was for women, and the rights accorded to husbands were distinct from those accorded to wives. In**

---

**fact it is probably not accurate to use the term 'rights of the woman' since a woman under the Islamic system of marriage has no human rights unless we consider that a slave has rights under a slave system. Marriage, in so far as women are concerned, is just like slavery to the slave, or the chains of serfdom to the serf."**[156]

If Dr. Nawal Sa'dawi is a Muslim rebel and a liberal thinker, let us hear it from the great Muslim scholar and philosopher Ghazali who stated the above position, some seven hundred years ago, when he summed up the situation, as follows:

**"The most satisfying and final word on the matter is that marriage is a form of slavery (riq). The woman is man's slave and her duty therefore is absolute obedience to the husband in all that he asks of her person. As Mohammad himself said: 'A woman, who at the moment of death enjoys the full approval of her husband, will find her place in Paradise'."**[157]

Ihy'a 'Ulum ed-Din in which Ghazali made this statement has been highly praised by many scholars. The famous Imam Nawawi said of it "The Ihy'a approaches being a qur'an." [158] The belief that the wife is the slave of the man is also shared by great scholars such as Razi<sup>159</sup>, and Ibn al-

---

'Araby as we have seen earlier by virtue of the payment of the dowry.[160]

Modern writers are not as straightforward as Ghazali in admitting that the woman is man's slave. But they do admit women's inferiority to men.

A modern writer said:

**"It is illogical and unfair to equate in any area between the woman who cares for dresses, fashion, hair styles etc. and the man who bears the responsibility on behalf of the woman and the children, and carries the misfortunes and the hardships for her sake and for the sake of the children."[161]**

Later on he added:

"The woman is equal to the man in Islam before the law... but the woman is not equal to the man with regard to her social worth and her subjective rights, for how can the commanding and the commanded, the great and the small, the knowledgeable and the ignorant, the sane and the mad, the unjust and the just, the honourable and the insignificant, the able and the unable, the working and the lazy, the strong and the weak be equal? We must not then mix between equality before the law and the social worth of the human being."[162]

---

If the woman, according to the above, has an unspecified lower social worth, Ghazali, who is called the 'rock of Islam' (huggat al-Islam) qualified what that lower social worth is, and called it by its true name: a slave. Mohammad however gave the real worth of the woman compared to the man when he said "Had I ordered anybody to prostrate before any one, I would have ordered women to prostrate before their husbands...". This is not a relationship of master and slave but approaches that of creator and creature!

It must be stressed at this point that not every Muslim follows the above teachings. The following two Hadith are very telling ones:

**"Narrated Ibn 'Omar : During the lifetime of the prophet we used to avoid chatting leisurely and freely with our wives lest some Divine inspiration might be revealed concerning us. But when the Prophet had died, we started chatting leisurely and freely (with them)."[163]**

"Narrated 'Urwa : The Prophet asked Abu Bakr for 'Aisha's hand in marriage. Abu Bakr said, 'but I am your brother.' The Prophet said, 'You are my brother in Allah's religion and His Book, But she ('Aisha) is lawful for me to marry.'"[164] (Mohammad was fifty years old, and 'Aisha was six or seven years old at that time, but the marriage was consummated when she turned nine years old).



---

The point is this: where there is strong religious leadership, the masses will surrender and follow the teachings. It is the leadership that passionately believes and teaches and demands the application of these teachings. Some Muslim leaders, even in the West, are calling for the practice of these teachings. For example in the country of Australia a Muslim scholar suggested that

**"Polygamy should be legalised and rape in marriage abolished ... He argued that a woman should not be able to charge her husband with rape." [165]**

Although not every Muslim follows these teachings, the teachings are there. So a nominal Muslim who does not follow these teachings now, can revert and become a committed believer, who would then not only observe them but call others to do likewise. The Iranian man in the film 'Not Without My Daughter' assured his little daughter once that he is as American as an apple pie, yet he could revert to be as strict a Muslim as Khomenie.

The above material, in the first place, is not the personal opinion of some individuals, but it represents the will of Allah as expressed in the teachings of Qur'an and the Hadith. What the Qur'an teaches in black and white, the Hadith teaches in colour. The Hadith quoted in this booklet is consistent with the spirit of Islam and the teachings of the Qur'an. If the Hadith was not so, it would have been rejected

---

out of hand, as fabricated, from the early centuries of Islam, not thirteen centuries later. On the contrary they have been compiled by the most pious Muslims of their time, quoted in the mothers of all books in Islamic literature, which has been published year after year, for more than a thousand years. In the light of the Qur'an the above Hadith was not condemned and rejected. It is when it is exposed to a different light that it is called into question.

The above quotations are not a collection of isolated, eccentric, or uncommon examples, but they are a representation of the main stream of a coherent consistent point of view regarding the place of women in Islam.

We have kept our comments to a bare minimum so that the reader can come to his own conclusions, rather than be influenced unduly by our interpretation.

We can see that the Qur'an, the sound Hadith, the commentators of the Qur'an, Muslim scholars, ancient and modern are consistent in teaching the superiority of men over women. Yet there are those who claim the equality of men and women in Islam. Some make the claim of equality due to real ignorance of the above material. Others however make the claim of equality in spite of their knowledge of the above material, as is the case in the film "Mohammad, a messenger of God". The script of this film was prepared by

---

Muslim scholars who knew very well the material brought to light in this booklet, and much more.

If you think this material is unbelievable, please check the references for yourself as a great number of them have been translated into English. And if you have read this booklet in haste, please read it again and draw your own conclusions.

---

**A related article:** [Muhammad and Sauda bin Zam'ah](#)

---

**Other languages:** We are looking for Christian organizations to publish / distribute the above article in German, French, Russian, Mandarin etc. If you are interested please contact [P. Newton](#) via email, giving full details of your organisation and the reasons for your interest.

**Correspondence:** Mr. Newton and Mr. Rafiqul-Haqq also invite you to write them with any requests, further questions, clarifications, disagreements ... by sending an [email](#).

---

[Further books by M. Rafiqul-Haqq and P. Newton](#)

---

---

## References:

1. Mishkat al-Masabih, English translation, Book 1, Introduction: Qur'an and Hadith, p.3.
2. Itqan fi 'Ulum al-Qur'an, Vol.II, p.182.
3. Mishkat al-Masabih, the English translation, Book 1, the importance of the Qur'an and Hadith, p.2,3.
4. Sahih Muslim, Introduction to English translation, P. ii.
5. Mishkat al-Masabih, the English translation, Book 1, the importance of the Qur'an and Hadith, p.5, Quoted from Malabudda Minhu, p.8
6. Ibid, the importance of the Qur'an and Hadith, p.2,3.
7. The Qur'an, 2:228
8. Ibn-Kathir, commenting on Q. 4:34.
9. Razi commenting on the Q. 4:11.
10. Ibid.
11. Razi commenting on the Q. 4:34.
12. Tuffaha, Ahmad Zaky, Al-Mar'ah wal- Islam, Dar al-Kitab al-Lubnani, Beirut, first edition, 1985, p.36.
13. Sahih Bukhari, Arabic-English translation, vol. 1, Introduction, p. xiv.
14. Ibid., 1 Hadith No. 301. See also vol. 3, Hadith No. 826.
15. At-Tafsir al-Kabir, Razi, commenting on Q. 30:21.
16. Al-Islam wa-l-Mar'ah al-Mu'aserah, Al-Bahi al-Khuli, Dar al-Qalam, Kuwait, 1984, p. 241.
17. Ibid.
18. Sahih Bukhari, Arabic-English translation, vol. 1 Hadith No. 28.

- 
19. The Qur'an, 2:282.
  20. The Age, Life behind a veil of Islam, 3/3/1992, p.11. This lady has an arts degree and post-graduate diploma in education.
  21. Al-Musanaf by Abu Bakr Ahmad Ibn 'Abd Allah Ibn Mousa Al-Kanadi who lived 557H., Vol. 1 Part 2, p. 263. See also Ihy'a 'Uloum ed-Din by Ghazali, Dar al-Kotob al-'Elmeyah, Beirut, Vol II, Kitab Adab al-Nikah, p. 52.
  22. Kanz-el-'Ummal, Vol. 21, Hadith No. 919.
  23. Tuffaha, Ahmad Zaky, Al-Mar'ah wal-Islam, Dar al-Kitab al-Lubnani, Beirut, first edition, 1985, p. 180.
  24. Ihy'a 'Uloum ed-Din by Ghazali, Dar al-Kotob al-'Elmeyah, Beirut, Vol II, Kitab Adab al-Nikah, p. 34.
  25. The World Book Dictionary.
  26. Kanz-el-'Ummal, Vol. 22, Hadith No. 858. See also Ihy'a 'Uloum ed-Din by Ghazali, Dar al-Kotob al-'Elmeyah, Beirut, Vol II, Kitab Adab al-Nikah, p. 65.
  27. Ihy'a 'Uloum ed-Din by Ghazali, Dar al-Kotob al-'Elmeyah, Beirut, Vol II, Kitab Adab al-Nikah, p. 65. Reported by Tirmizi as a true and good Ahadith.
  28. Ibid., p. 65.
  29. Dr. Mohammad Sa'id Ramadan al-Buti, Ela kul Fataten Tu'min be-Allah, Mu'asasat ar-Risalah, Beirut, 1987, Eighth edition, p. 41,42.
  30. Ibid., p. 43.
  31. Ibid., p. 47,48.
  32. Ibid., p. 98.

- 
33. Sahih Bukhari, Arabic-English translation, vol. VII Hadith No. 113.
34. Ibid., Hadith No. 114.
35. Ihy'a 'Uloum ed-Din by Ghazali, Dar al-Kotob al-'Elmeyah, Beirut, Vol II, Kitab Adab al-Nikah, p. 51.
36. The authority of that Hadith is classed as Sahih. It is quoted by Ahmad and al-Nisa'i
37. Ihy'a 'Uloum ed-Din by Ghazali, Dar al-Kotob al-'Elmeyah, Beirut, Vol II, Kitab Adab al-Nikah, p. 51.
- 37a. Al-Ghazali, *Nasihah al-Muluk*, as quoted in: Essid, Yassine, *A critique of the origins of Islamic economic thought*, E.J. Brill, Leiden, New York, Koln, 1995, p. 205.
38. Mishkat al-Masabih, English translation, Book I, Section 'Duties of husband and wife', Hadith No. 61.
39. Ibid., Hadith No. 54 (agreed upon). See also Bukhari, Arabic-English translation, vol. VII, Hadith no. 121.
40. Dr. Mohammad Sa'id Ramadan al-Buti, *Ela kul Fataten Tu'min be-Allah, Mu'asasat ar-Risalah*, Beirut, 1987, Eighth edition, p. 55.
41. 'Abd ar-Rahman al-Gaziri, *al-Fiqh 'ala al-Mazahib al-Arba'a*, Dar al-Kutub al-'Elmeyah, 1990, vol. 4, p. 7.
42. The Qur'an, 26:166, Maulvi Mohammad 'Ali's translation.
43. Qortobi, commenting on Q. 30:21.
44. Suyuti, commenting on Q. 4:34, see also Mishkat al-Masabih, English translation, Book I, Hadith No. ii, 74.
45. Mishkat al-Masabih, English translation, Book I, Section 'Duties of husband and wife', Hadith No. ii, 60.

- 
46. Suyuti, commenting on Q. 4:34 and Kanz-el-'Ummal, Vol. 22, Hadith No. 868.
47. Mishkat al-Masabih, English translation, Section 'Duties of husband and wife', Hadith No. 70. Reported by Abu Dawood, Ahmad, Tirmizi, Ibn Magah and Ibn Haban.
48. Tuffaha, Ahmad Zaky, Al-Mar'ah wal- Islam, Dar al-Kitab al-Lubnani, Beirut, first edition, 1985, p. 176. It is also quoted in Al-Musanaf by Abu Bakr Ahmad Ibn 'Abd Allah Ibn Mousa Al-Kanadi who lived 557H., vol. 1 part 2, p. 255.
49. Suyuti, commenting on Q. 4:34.
50. Sunan Ibn Magah, Kitab al-Nikah, Hadith No. 1850.
51. See Razi and Qortobi commenting on Q. 30:21.
52. Dictionary of Qur'anic terms and concepts, Mustansir Mir, Garland publishing inc. New York& London, 1987, p. 235.
53. See for example Q. 2:231, 232, 233.
54. Mishkat al-Masabih, English translation, Book 1, section 'duties of husband and wife', Hadith No. 68.
55. The Qur'an, 4:34. (Arberry's translation).
56. The Holy Qur'an, Yusuf Ali's Translation.
57. Razi, At-tafsir al-Kabir, on Q. 4:34.
58. Mishkat al-Masabih, English translation, Book 1, section 'duties of husband and wife', Hadith No.50.
59. Ibid., Hadith No.76.
60. Ibid., Footnote No 138.
61. Ibid, Footnote No 140.
62. Ibn Kathir, commenting on Q. 4:34, this Hadith is also

- 
- reported by Abu Dawood and al-Nisa'i and Ibn Magah.
63. Guardian Weekly, 23/12/1990, Violence against Women Highlighted, p. 13.
64. Sayid Qotb, Fi Zilal al-Qur'an, commenting on the Qur'an 4:34.
65. The Australian Minaret, published by the Australian Federation of the Islamic Councils, November 1980, p.10.
66. Sayid Qotb, Fi Zilal al-Qur'an, commenting on the Qur'an 4:34.
67. Al-Bahi al-Khuli, Al-Islam wa-l-Mar'ah al-Mu'aserah, Dar al-Qalam, Kuwait, 1984, p. 105.
68. The Qur'an 4:128. (Arberry's translation).
69. Sahih Bukhari, Arabic-English translation, vol. 7, Hadith No. 134.
70. Ibid., Hadith No. 130&131
71. Ihy'a 'Uloum ed-Din by Ghazali, Dar al-Kotob al-'Elmeyah, Beirut, Vol II, Kitab Adab al-Nikah, p. 52.
- 71a. AN INTRODUCTION TO THE SCIENCE OF HADITH, Al-Quran Society London, Author: Dr. Suhaib Hasan, <http://www.islamworld.net/hadith.html>
- 71b. E.g. No. 410 in "500 Ahadith", <http://wings.buffalo.edu/sa/muslim/isl/hadith1.html>
- 71c. as quoted in "Family Values in Islam", <http://www.pakistanlink.com/religion/religion-8-23-96.html>
- 71d. Sahih Bukhari, English-Arabic, Book VII, Kitab an-Nikah, Hadith No. 130.
- 71e. Ihya' 'Uloum ed-Din by Ghazali, Dar al-Kotob al-



- 
- 'Elmeyah, Beirut, pp. 50-51.
72. The Qur'an 4:3.
73. The Qur'an 4:129. (Dawood's translation).
74. Tuffaha, Ahmad Zaky, Al-Mar'ah wal-Islam, Dar al-Kitab al-Lubnani, Beirut, first edition, 1985, p. 58. See also Razi and al-Jalalayn on the above verses. And Ihy'a 'Uloum ed-Din by Ghazali, Dar al-Kotob al-'Elmeyah, Beirut, Vol II, Kitab Adab al-Nikah, p. 54. And Ibn al-'Arabi, Ahkam al-Qur'an, vol. 1, p.504.
75. Razi, At-tafsir al-kabir, commenting on Q. 4:129.
76. Ibid., commenting on Q. 4:3.
77. Ibid., commenting on Q. 4:3.
78. Ibid., commenting on Q. 4:3.
79. Ihy'a 'Uloum ed-Din by Ghazali, Dar al-Kotob al-'Elmeyah, Beirut, Vol II, Kitab Adab al-Nikah, p.34.
80. Abd ar-Rahman al-Gaziri, al-Fiqh 'ala al-Mazahib al-Arba'a, Dar al-Kutub al-'Elmeyah, 1990, vol. 4, p. 89.
81. Ibid.
82. Ihy'a 'Uloum ed-Din by Ghazali, Dar al-Kotob al-'Elmeyah, Beirut, Vol II, Kitab Adab al-Nikah, p. 33.
83. Ibid.
84. Sahih Bukhari, Arabic-English translation, vol. 7, Hadith No. 142. And vol. 1, Hadith No.268.
85. Mohammad Ibn Saad, al-Tabakat al-Kobra, Dar al-Tahrir, Cairo, 1970, Vol 8, p. 139.
86. Ihy'a 'Uloum ed-Din by Ghazali, Dar al-Kotob al-'Elmeyah, Beirut, Vol II, Kitab Adab al-Nikah, p.27.

- 
87. Ibid., p.34.
  88. Razi, At-tafsir al-kabir, commenting on Q. 4:3.
  89. Qortobi, commenting on Q. 4:3.
  90. Mishkat al-Masabih, Book II, Divorce, Hadith No. 137.
  91. Sahih Bukhari, English translation by M. Muhsin Khan, Vol. VII, pp. 6&7, see Hadith No. 10.
  92. Mishkat al-Masabih, Book 1, duties of parents, Hadith No. 15
  93. 'Abd ar-Rahman al-Gaziri, al-Fiqh 'ala al-Mazahib al-Arba'a, Dar al-Kutub al- 'Elmeyah, 1990, vol. 4, p. 522.
  94. Ibid., p. 523.
  95. Mishkat al-Masabih, Book 1, duties of husband and wife, Hadith No.62
  96. The Qur'an 44:51-54 (Pickthall's translation).
  97. The Qur'an, 55:56-58 (Arberry's translation).
  98. The Qur'an, 55:72 (Rodwells translation).
  99. Pickthall in his translation of the Qur'an omits this description all together, although it is found in Dawood's, Rodwell's, and Arberry's translations.
  100. The Qur'an, 78:33 (Arberry's translation).
  101. Ibn Kathir, commenting on Q. 78:33.
  102. Sahih Muslim, English translation, Hadith No. 6793, see also 6794, 6795 &6797.
  103. Ibn-Kathir commenting on Q. 56:35-37.
  104. Mishkat al-Masabih, English-Arabic translation, Book IV, Chapter XLII, Paradise and Hell, Hadith No.24.
  105. Sunan at-Tirmizi, kitab sifat al-Ganah, Hadith No. 2536.

- 
106. Ibn-Kathir, vol. 8, page 11, commentary on Q. 56:35-37, published by Dar Ash-sha'b, editorial footnote by the publisher explaining the meaning of 'dahman'.
107. Ibid., commenting on Q. 56:35-37. 108. The Qur'an 36:55.
109. Tafsir al-Jalalayn on Q. 36:55.
110. Ihy'a 'Uloum ed-Din by Ghazali, Dar al-Kotob al-'Elmeyah, Beirut, Vol IV, p. 575.
111. Ibn 'Abbas, Tanweer al-Miqbas, commenting on Q. 36:55.
112. 'Abd ar-Rahman al-Gaziri, al-Fiqh 'ala al-Mazahib al-Arba'a, Dar al-Kutub al-'Elmeyah, 1990, vol. 4, p. 7.
113. Ibid., p. 9.
114. 'Ibid., p. 8.
115. Sahih Bukhari, English translation by M. Muhsin Khan, Vol. VII, Hadith No. 81. See also Mishkat al-Masabih, Book II, under section dower, Hadith No. 53.
116. Encyclopaedia of Islam, under 'Mahr'.
117. Mishkat al-Masabih, Book II, under section dower, Hadith No. 57., reported from Abu Daud also reported by Ahmad.
118. Ibid., Hadith No. 58., reported by Tirmizi
119. Sahih Bukhari, English translation by M. Muhsin Khan, Vol. VII, Hadith No. 80.
120. Al-Islam wa-l-Mar'ah al-Mu'aserah, Al-Bahi al-Khuli, Dar al-Qalam, Kuwait, 1984, p. 57, reported in Musnad Ahmad.
121. 'Abd ar-Rahman al-Gaziri, al-Fiqh 'ala al-Mazahib al-

- 
- Arba'a, Dar al-Kutub al- 'Elmeyah, 1990, vol. 4, p. 8.  
122. Qurtubi.
123. Encyclopaedia of Islam, under 'Nikah'.
124. Ibn Kathir, commenting on the Q. 4:24.
125. Ibid.
126. Razi, commenting on Q. 4:25.
127. Ibid., commenting on Q. 4:24.
128. Ibid.
129. Qurtubi, commenting on Q. 4:24.
130. Abu Bakr Mohammad Ibn 'Abd Allah known as Ibn al-  
'Araby, Ahkam al-Qur'an, Part 1, p.387.
131. Ibid., p.401.
132. Ibid., p.317.
133. 'Abd ar-Rahman al-Gaziri, al-Fiqh 'ala al-Mazahib al-  
Arba'a, Dar al-Kutub al-'Elmeyah, 1990, vol. 4, p. 488.
134. Encyclopaedia of Islam, under 'Nikah'.
135. 'Abd ar-Rahman al-Gaziri, al-Fiqh 'ala al-Mazahib al-  
Arba'a, Dar al-Kutub al-'Elmeyah, 1990, vol. 4, p.495.
136. Encyclopaedia of Islam, under 'Nikah'
137. 'Abd ar-Rahman al-Gaziri, al-Fiqh 'ala al-Mazahib al-  
Arba'a, Dar al-Kutub al-'Elmeyah, 1990, vol. 4, pp. 495-497.
138. Ibid., p. 498.
139. Ibid., p. 497-498.
140. Ibid., p. 497-499.
141. Ibid., p. 5.
142. Mishkat al-Masabih, Book 1, duty towards children  
Hadith No. 43.

- 
143. Ihya' 'Uloum ed-Din by Ghazali, Dar al-Kotob al-'Elmeyah, Beirut, vol. II, Kitab Adab al-Nikah, p. 45.
  144. Ibid., p. 35.
  145. Ibid., P.33. Also quoted in Sahih Muslim, English translation, Hadith No. 3240.
  146. Sahih Bukhari, Arabic-English translation, vol. vii , Hadith No. 33.
  147. Dr. Mohammad Sa'id Ramadan al-Buti, Ela kul Fataten Tu'min be-Allah, Mu'asasat ar\_Risalah, Beirut, 1987, Eighth edition, p. 19.
  148. Ibid., p. 16.
  149. Ihya' 'Uloum ed-Din by Ghazali, Dar al-Kotob al-'Elmeyah, Beirut, vol. II, Kitab Adab al-Nikah, p. 53.
  - 150..Sahih Bukhari, Arabic-English translation, vol. 1, section 'A menstruating woman should not fast', Hadith No. 301.
  151. Sahih Muslim, English translation, Kitab Al-Riqaq, chapter MCXL Hadith No. 6600.
  152. Dr. Mohammad Sa'id Ramadan al-Buti, Ela kul Fataten Tu'min be-Allah, Mu'asasat ar\_Risalah, Beirut, 1987, Eighth edition, p. 21.
  153. Kanz-el-'Ummal, Vol. 21, Hadith No. 825.
  154. Ibid., Hadith No. 829.
  155. Ibid., Hadith No. 831.
  156. Nawal El Sa'dawi, The Hidden Face of Eve, Zed Press, London, 1980, pp. 139, 140.
  157. Ihya' 'Uloum ed-Din by Ghazali, Dar al-Kotob al-'Elmeyah, Beirut, vol. II, Kitab Adab al-Nikah, p. 64

- 
158. Ibid., Vol V, p. 6.
159. Razi, commenting on the Qur'an 33:51.
160. Ibn al-'Arabi, Ahkam al-Qur'an, part one, p. 63.
161. Tuffaha, Ahmad Zaky, Al-Mar'ah wal-Islam, first edition, Dar al-Kitab al-Lubnani, Beirut, 1985, pp. 33.
162. Ibid., P.37.
163. Sahih Bukhari, English translation by M. Muhsin Khan, Vol. VII, Hadith No. 115.
164. Ibid., Hadith No. 18.
165. The Sun-Herald, an Australian news paper, April 28, 1991, p. 21.

## THE PUNISHMENT FOR THEFT

### ***ACCORDING TO THE QUR'AN***

The Qur'an teaches that the person who steals should have his hand cut off; stating:

**"the thief male, and female: cut off the hand of both, as a recompense of what they have earned, and a punishment exemplary from God; God is All-mighty All-wise."[7]**

This cutting off of the hand serves as retribution for any profit or gain the thief has made and as a punishment from God.

---

Later Muslim scholars insisted that this punishment could only be practised in a society where the basic needs of its citizens are adequately met.

### ***ACCORDING TO THE HADITH***

The Qur'an teaches that the hand of the thief should be cut off, the Hadith adds that Mohammad applied this form of punishment in his own time, as is clear from the following collection of incidences from the Hadith. (We assume that the citizens under his leadership were provided for adequately.)

**1. Jaber reported that a thief was brought to the Prophet who commanded, "Maim him (his hand)" and it was done. He was brought for the second time. He said, "Maim him," and it was done. Afterwards he was brought for the third time. Again The Prophet said, "Maim him." And then it was cut off. Afterwards the thief was brought for the fourth time and when the prophet said, "Maim him" his leg was cut off. When he was then brought for the fifth time, he said: "Kill him." So we took him and killed him. Afterwards we dragged him and threw him into a well and threw stones over him." [8]**

---

2. "Fuzalah-Ibn-Obaid reported that a thief was brought to the Prophet and his hand was cut off and on a further order from the Prophet, the hand was hung around his neck." [9]

3. "'A'isha reported that Allah's Messenger cut off the hand of a thief for a quarter of a dinar and upwards."[10]

4. "Abu Huraira reported Allah's Messenger as saying: 'let there be the curse of Allah upon a thief who steals an egg and his hand is cut off and steals a rope and his hand is cut off'"[11]

5. "It is narrated in Sharih Sunnat that Safwan-b-Umayyah came to Medina and slept in the mosque using his sheet as pillow. A thief came and stole his sheet. Safwan overtook him and came with him to the Messenger of Allah. Mohammad gave the order for the thief's hand to be cut off. Safwan said, "I did not wish it (that punishment); I give it (the sheet) to him as charity," upon which the Messenger of Allah asked, "Why didn't you (tell him) before you came with him?"[12]

In other words it is too late, and the man's hand must be cut off.



---

6. Tabari, commenting on the Table:38 reports an incident which supports this last teaching: "A woman stole jewellery from some people who then brought her to The Prophet. He ordered that her right hand be cut off. The woman then asked him if there was room for repentance to which he replied, "Today [that is after your hand is cut off] you will be pure from your sin like the day you were born."[13]

**From the above we can see that:**

1. Both the Qur'an and the Hadith require the amputation of the hand of the person who steals. From Hadith No. 6 and according to the teaching of the Fukaha (Muslim scholars), the thief's right hand is cut off at the wrist.[14]
2. The value of the stolen article that calls for the cutting off of the hand must be above a quarter of a dinar.[15]
3. Repentance by voluntary restitution and determining never to steal again, does not spare the person from having his hand cut off. This is also the opinion of Ibn 'Abbas who was one of the early renowned followers of Mohammad. This view is supported by commentators on the Qur'an, eg. see Razi.[16]
4. In all the collected Hadith on the subject, not once was a person forgiven or the punishment waived. In every case the thief's hand was cut off.

---

## ***ACCORDING TO THE BIBLE***

In the Torah (the first five books of the Bible), God gave laws whereby His people could deal with the problem of theft. We find four responses to the problem:

1. If a man steals an article, but is repentant he has to pay back the worth of whatever he stole plus twenty percent.

**"The LORD said to Moses: "If anyone sins and is unfaithful to the LORD by deceiving his neighbour about something entrusted to him or left in his care or stolen, or if he cheats him, or if he finds lost property and lies about it, or if he swears falsely, or if he commits any such sin that people may do - when he thus sins and becomes guilty, he must return what he has stolen or taken by extortion, or what was entrusted to him, or the lost property he found, or whatever it was he swore falsely about. He must make restitution in full, add a fifth of the value to it and give it all to the owner on the day he presents his guilt offering." [17]**

2. If he is not repentant and whatever he stole is found in his possession he must pay back double.

---

**"If the stolen animal is found alive in his [the thief's] possession-- whether ox or donkey or sheep--he must pay back double."[18]**

**3. If he has disposed of what he has stolen, by selling it or using it, he has to pay between four to five times the value of the stolen article.**

**"If a man steals an ox or a sheep and slaughters it or sells it, he must pay back five head of cattle for the ox and four sheep for the sheep ... A thief must certainly make restitution, but if he has nothing, he must be sold to pay for his theft."[19]**

**4. If he can not pay back, he must be sold as a slave and work as such for six years, after that he is to be set free.**

Unlike the punishment of slavery which was permanent, this one is temporary, lasting only six years. In addition, when freed, the man must be supplied with resources that will prepare him for and give him a good start in his new life. The Bible thus states:

**"If a fellow Hebrew, a man or a woman, is sold to you and he serves you six years, in the seventh year you must let him go free. And when you release him, do not send him away empty-handed. Supply him liberally from your flock, your threshing floor and your wine-**

---

press. Give to him as the Lord your God has blessed you."[20]

It is clear that the retribution is administered in such a way that stolen property is compensated for by property, even when the thief is enslaved for six years, his period of enslavement is repayment for the stolen property. Bodily damage is never made to compensate for property damage, as is the case in Islam. It should also to be noted that the punishment is proportional to the severity of the sin - the more a person hides his sin and profits from crime, the more compensation he has to pay. The sooner he confesses his crime, the lighter the punishment.

### ***WHY DO TEACHINGS IN THE QUR'AN DIFFER FROM THE BIBLE?***

Moses was given one message in the Torah: In God's message to Moses, punishment for theft is mainly restitution and compensation with some concession for repentance. The message for Mohammad in the Qur'an is a different one, punishment for theft is the inflicting of a permanent physical handicap. Can the two messages be reconciled?

God is sovereign, and could well provide different laws for different circumstances. Were the circumstances different for Mohammad to those at the time of Moses? Muslims

---

claim that God did indeed speak through Moses but gave a later, perfect and final revelation through Mohammad. If His word to Mohammad is inconsistent with His word to Moses - does that mean that God cancelled His first message? Or could it be that the voice that spoke to one of them was in fact not that of God the Creator? The following discussion may throw light on this dilemma.

## **THE HAND: A DIVINE MASTERPIECE**

### ***1. THE SOURCE OF POWER OF THE HAND***

Let us look at the magnificence of the creation of God, manifest in the human hand.

The hand is a masterpiece of engineering. It is immensely strong. The whole weight of the body, for instance, can be supported by the small bones, muscles and tendons of the end joints of the fingers, of even one hand alone. There is enormous power in the hand for lifting weights, chopping wood or rowing a boat, yet the bulk of that power, while delivered by the hand, actually comes from the arm and the shoulder. Thus the source of the major part of the hand's power is located away from the hand leaving the tiny muscles which are located in the hand itself to be used in fine precision movement. Imagine how clumsy the hand would be if God had located the biceps within it. One would not then be able to thread a needle or play a violin or even write.

---

## ***2. THE NUMBER OF MOVEMENTS OF THE HAND***

When God the Creator creates, He creates so magnificently and generously. When man first attempted to design an artificial hand, he came up with a two-pronged claw which could open (and shut) and rotate, two basic movements. The human hand has an infinite number of movements, with "seventy separate muscles contributing to hand movements." [21] Even if man could invent an artificial hand that resembles the mechanics of the human hand, this artificial hand would not be able to function like the one God created.

If one is to move the tip of the little finger in a hand that has been severed from a body, "four minutes are needed to sort through the intricate network of tendons and muscles to arrange at least a dozen muscles in the correct configuration and tension, so that the little finger firmly moves without the proximal joints buckling." [22]

Every day we make countless number of such movements without giving them a second thought, and they are done in a split second.

How generous God the Creator has been in providing us with such incredibly complex, in-built, multi-purpose tools which can hold, lift, push, pull, twist, wave, flick, caress, clap, slap,

---

pinch, punch, touch, smooth, scratch, point, beckon, rub, knock, stroke, and squeeze!

### ***3. THE TISSUES IN THE PALM OF THE HAND***

The tissue in the palm of the hand is a special tissue. It is not flabby like the tissue found in the cheeks and not as hard as the muscles, but of special design so that it fulfils the gripping function of the hand. Dr. Paul Brand the famous hand surgeon explains:

**"Underneath the skin, in the palm of the hand, lie globules of fat with the look and consistency of tapioca pudding. Fat globules, so soft as to be almost fluid, cannot hold their own shape, and so they are surrounded by interwoven fibrils of collagen, like balloons caught in a supporting rope net."**

"... I grasp a hammer in the palm of my hand. Each cluster of fat cells changes shape in response to the pressure. It yields but cannot be pushed aside because of firm collagen fibrils around it. The resulting tissue, constantly shifting and quivering, becomes compliant, fitting its shape and its stress points to the precise shape of the hammer. Engineers nearly shout when they analyse this amazing property, for they cannot design a

---

material which so perfectly balances elasticity and viscosity."[23]

#### ***4. THE MOIST PALM OF THE HAND***

The palm of the hand is always moist. Any one who works with sand and cement becomes fully aware of this. When the palm of the hand is dry, the person has very little control of the object he grasps. This continuous wetness of the palm increases our ability to grasp any object, by creating a kind of vacuum between the hand and the surface of that object.

Also this continuous moistness acts as a little cooler in hot weather as the moisture continually evaporates; thus helping to cool the whole body.

#### ***5. THE MARVEL OF THE BLOOD SUPPLY TO THE HAND***

Every part of the human hand is a masterpiece of engineering. Jonathan Jones, a plastic surgeon made the following comments:

**Why are the arteries located on the palmer side of the hand in such a way that they are not choked off as we grasp heavy objects? How interesting it is that the radial and ulnar arteries at the wrist pass into the palm where they form dual arcades that allow continued**



---

**blood supply to the tissues even when objects are grasped!**

And how is it that the paired digital arteries to each finger are so enveloped with ligamentous supports that they will not kink off during finger flexion (bending)?

Why is it that the low pressure venous system is primarily located on the back of the hand where restriction of blood-flow would not occur with grasp?

Many surgeons have devoted countless hours to developing some understanding as to how blood flows to the small bones within the wrist. The built-in servo-mechanisms which regulate blood-flow to the hand in response to tissue needs are only now beginning to be understood.[23a]

The marvel of blood supply to the hand took scientists many hours to discover, but spare a thought for the humble nails. Try not to scratch your body for the next ten minutes and you will discover how wonderful even the humble nails are!

The whole hand is a masterpiece.

## ***6. THE MEASURE OF THE HAND'S IMPORTANCE***

The hand is not merely a masterpiece of engineering but a masterpiece of Divine design. While each of the other organs

---

of sense; eye, ear, nose, tongue, are also important to us and reveal the generosity of the Creator, a good case can be made for regarding the hand as the most important of them all.

Every part of the body is represented by a specialised area of the brain. The eyes, the nose, the ears, even the toes are represented in the brain. Just like a factory operated by a computer, every department is represented in the computer. The larger the area of representation, the more important that department is. The area of the brain representing the hand is greater than that for the eyes or ears and, in fact, is about equal to the area representing the whole of the body from the waist down.<sup>24</sup> This is the degree of importance the Creator Himself placed on the hand. It is safe to say that losing a hand is really more disastrous than losing an eye or an ear. A blind person can still read Braille and find his way with a stick: knowledge is entering his brain through his hand. Deaf people can still talk to each other with their hands.

## ***7. THE HAND PERFECT IN DESIGN***

Dr. Paul Brand said "I could fill a room with surgery manuals suggesting various ways to repair hands that have been injured. But in forty years of study, I have never read of a technique that has succeeded in improving a normal, healthy hand."<sup>[25]</sup>

---

In other words the hand is so perfect that no one can improve on the work of the Creator. It is not only precious and important, practical, and brilliantly designed, but it is also a Divine masterpiece fashioned by God the Creator Himself.

The question that must be asked is: "How do people treat masterpieces?" Or perhaps, "What does the artist himself do when one of his masterpieces are spoiled and tainted?"

## **ALLAH: IS HE THE CREATOR?**

### ***THE MARK OF THE TRUE GOD***

If someone discovers a painting by Picasso, Van Gogh or Leonardo De Vinci - which is damaged on one side, is it likely that he will take a pair of scissors and cut away that damaged part? We would be horrified and would rightly deduce that that person has no idea of the real value of the painting. If an average person, with small knowledge of the work of Leonardo De Vinci would not dream of cutting that damaged part, is it likely that Leonardo De Vinci himself would give instructions to cut parts of his paintings, even if they were damaged?

The frustrating attempt to capture the American satellite Intelsat 6, is a powerful illustration of the brilliance of the design of the human hand. This is what one of the newspapers commented on that event:

---

**"They did it by hands? Mercy! Whatever will they think of next? After all those millions of dollars, computer hours, mathematical calculations, high-tech solutions and earthbound rehearsals in swimming pools, the answer to rescuing the disabled Intelsat 6 satellite was right there all the time at the ends of the astronauts' arms. Inspired by the pictures of your fellow shuttler, Pierre J. Thout, alone in space and facing the painful frustration of trying to nab that elusive floating tin can with his five-meter "capture bar" [which was worth 9 million dollars, and after trying for four days still failed to capture the satellite], your countrymen deluged NASA's mission control centre with more weird and wonderful suggestions. Use magnets, they said. Try bungee cords, giant fish hooks, Velcro strips and even some kind of superglue ...**

All of our efforts to build a computer capable of the breadth and complexity of thought of the human brain have failed. All of our efforts to create robotic hands with the range and subtlety of manipulative skill of the human variety have failed. Let us face it. We haven't even been able to sort out the best way for astronauts to go to the toilet. But when we stop trying to be so clever and use what nature has given us by way of the

---

remarkable design of our bodies and our innate commonsense, we are sharp ... What a piece of work is man, indeed."

**The above news paper should've said 'What a wonderful creation is man, indeed'. Nevertheless, they made a point. The 9 million dollar capture bar, supported by the most sophisticated technology, after almost four days of attempts failed to capture the satellite. And the God given hand so simply did it in no time. Indeed, what a divine master piece is the human hand!**

The human hand is not a human masterpiece but a Divine masterpiece. It is more precious, and far greater than any human achievement. Will the Creator of the hand give orders for His masterpiece, to be cut off and destroyed to penalise a person for theft of property? Or did He command that a greater amount of property must be given back; that the punishment for stealing property should be property, as in His commandment given to Moses? Property damage should be compensated for by property. If we use the analogy of the human masterpieces it is safe to say that damaging part of the body to compensate for the loss of some property is like damaging the masterpiece to compensate for the loss of some paint. No amount of paint and canvas will compensate for one of Picasso's masterpieces. There is more than paint and canvas in a

---

masterpiece. Could it be that the hand-cutting law originated from someone who was not the hand's creator?

Would the God who knows the worth of His creation order the destruction of one of His most important masterpieces - the hand- for the sake of property damage? If we compare the teachings of the Qur'an and the teaching of the Bible on the subject of theft, we can see that the God who spoke in the Bible behaves as a Creator- who knows the worth of the hand- and the one who spoke to Mohammad does not appear to behave like a Creator. When two mothers came to King Solomon with one child, each claiming that the child belongs to her and seeking his judgement on the matter king Solomon said, "Bring me a sword." So they brought a sword for the king. He then gave an order: "Cut the living child in two and give half to one and half to the other."

The woman whose son was alive was filled with compassion for her son and said to the king, "Please, my lord, give her the living baby! Don't kill him!" But the other woman said, "Neither I nor you shall have him. Cut him in two!"

Then the king gave his ruling: "Give the living baby to the first woman. Do not kill him; she is his mother."[26]

What made king Solomon come to this conclusion? It is because he saw that the woman who did not want the child to be cut in two behaved like a mother; she had the heart

---

and compassion of a mother. She would rather lose the baby and spare his life than lose him altogether. Likewise it is the God who spoke in the Bible who behaves like a Creator, who knows the real worth of the human hand but the one who spoke in the Qur'an does not behave like a Creator.

## **THE MARK OF IDOLS AND MAN-CREATED GODS**

It must be remembered that the crime of theft is a form of damage to property, but the cutting of the hand causes damage to the body. There is a big difference between property damage and bodily damage, for no amount of property damage will ever equal bodily damage. Property can be compensated for or replaced, but where can one find a replacement for the human hand? It is important to note that not one of the many prophets of the true God, the Creator, (before Mohammad's time) ever delivered a commandment specifying bodily damage as a compensation for property damage. Prophets of idol worshippers called for such punishments.

For example the Assyrian law states:

**"If a seignior's wife has stolen something from another seignior's house, exceeding the value of five minas of lead, the owner of the stolen (property) shall swear, 'I never let her take (it); there was a theft in my house,' if her husband (so) desires, he may give up the stolen**

---

(property) and ransom her (but) cut off her ears. If her husband does not wish to ransom her, the owner of the stolen (property) shall take her and cut off her nose."[27] (emphasis added)

And the Law of Hammurabi states:

"If a seignior hired a(nother) seignior to oversee his field, and lending him feed-grain, entrusting him with oxen, contracted with him to cultivate the field, if that seignior stole the seed or fodder and it has been found in his possession, they shall cut off his hand."[28] (emphasis added)

The true God, the Creator, never commanded any form of bodily damage as a punishment or compensation for property damage. He commanded bodily damage for bodily damage and property damage for property damage. The reason is obvious. The Creator knows that man is the crown of His creation on earth; man is God's vice regent on earth, property was made for him, he was not made for property. In ancient Israel God commanded Moses: 'an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth'.[29] The key issue in giving such order is fairness in punishment, and retribution. Never in all of God's commands to Moses did He prescribe a bodily damage as a punishment for property damage. For all



---

property damages God commanded a certain amount of property restitution. To command that any part of the body be destroyed as a retribution for property damage, no matter how valuable the property, is inconsistent with the nature of God as the Creator. Bodily damage is the retribution for bodily damage, and property restitution is the penalty for property damage. For in the eye of the Creator, no amount of property will be a sufficient exchange for damage to the body of another human being, who was created in the image of God .

#### **ALLAH: IS HE ALL-KNOWING?**

THE MAGNITUDE OF THE LOSS CAUSED BY THE CUTTING OFF OF THE HAND

#### ***1 - IT CAUSES LOSS OF EFFICIENCY OF THE ARM AND THE OTHER HAND***

The loss of the hand is not the only damage that results from this form of punishment. Cutting off the hand destroys the efficiency of the arm and makes it almost useless, for the hand is connected to the forearm which is connected to the upper arm. To cut off the hand that God created destroys the usefulness of the arm, for it makes the muscles and the tendons that empowers and controls the hand useless.

---

Not only does this punishment render useless the arm and the forearm God created to work together, but it makes the hands that were intended to work in pairs useless as well. The loss of one of them does not make it a loss of 50 percent of the ability of the hands. The cutting off of one hand is to a degree a form of destruction of the other hand. For the two work together. They were designed to work together, just as one side of a pincer works with the other side. Try to hammer a nail , or saw a piece of timber , or try to peel an orange or even to cut an onion with one hand. Cutting off one hand is a virtual destruction of the other, resulting in the loss of much of its effectiveness. The thief is left also with a permanent affliction that hinders him for the rest of his life. It jeopardises his chances of future employment, and ironically might force him to steal again merely to satisfy his basic needs. Is this a Divine solution to the problem of theft?

## ***2 - UNEXPECTED AFTER-EFFECTS OF HAND CUTTING CAN CAUSE DEATH***

In the first centuries of Islam, when its followers practised cutting off of the hand of the person who stole, "the stump of the hand used to be held in hot oil or fire to stop the bleeding "[30].

But this burning is an additional punishment.

---

Here the punishment was exceeded by the additional pain caused by trying to stop the bleeding and the infection. (Can this form of punishment come from the Just God?) There are even cases where people whose hands were cut off subsequently died from infection. The punishment in those cases grew in severity to equal the punishment for murder. We could deduce that whoever gave that law didn't know the implications of this form of punishment. Surely God knows exactly how to prescribe everything with precision, not only in His creation but also in imposing punishment. How would you react if your motor mechanic, while repairing the starter motor, ruins the engine and the transmission, causing the whole car to be written off? Or how would you react if your builder, while making an opening for a door in one of the walls brought the whole house down? God is far too wise to be taken by surprise. There are no miscalculations with God. Only people can fall into this trap.

### ***3 - THE PSYCHOLOGICAL EFFECTS OF HAND CUTTING IN THE EAST***

But that is not all. Hands have cultural as well as practical significance. There are vast numbers of people in the East in countries like Pakistan and India whose right hands have a special significance not found in Western countries. For example, they give money only with their right hand, and

---

they eat with their right hand, because they use their left hand to clean their private parts. The left hand would never be used to place food in the mouth or even to pay money.

If a person in that part of the world steals and has his right hand cut off, he is doomed to eat with the hand with which he cleans himself. And if the left hand is cut off instead of the right, the problem still remains, for that person will still eat with the same hand which he uses to clean himself. The punishment does not stop at the loss of the hand but thus becomes a terrible stigma contaminating his social dealings with others, and brings him down almost to the level of animals.

Thus the punishment has at least been doubled in such countries. But God is just, and All-knowing. He knows the social customs of all peoples. His Laws and penalties will not have consequences which effectively make them twice as severe in some countries as in others. In such places it could, conceivably, be worse than death which is the punishment for adultery. The adulterer suffers death once but the thief suffers psychologically every day and every moment of his remaining life. The absence of his hand will proclaim every minute, "thief! thief! thief!" Even more humiliating is the personal agony caused by the inability of the victim to accept himself, and the unbearable revulsion he feels at his every attempt to eat food using the same hand with which he cleans himself. This form of punishment inflicts a

---

different and extra kind of handicap; a disgrace that can not be wiped away from the mind of the 'victim' himself. So this punishment becomes a life long torture.

Is this new and added punishment consistent with the justice of the All- knowing God? Did the cutting off of the hand come from the One who knows the customs of all the peoples of the world or did it come from a mind that was unaware of the significance of the right hand in the east?

## **ALLAH: IS HE JUST ?**

### **THEFT COMPARED TO FORNICATION IN PUNISHMENT**

In Islam the prescribed punishment for theft is cutting off of the hand, while it prescribes one hundred lashes[31] for the sin of fornication by a single man. We can only conclude that according to the Qur'an, property theft is many times more serious than sin against persons. A single man who commits fornication, can go and live in another city. There is no permanent scar, no permanent identification for all to see. But a person with a hand cut off is marked for the rest of his life. If a single man fornicates with someone's daughter, he will receive one hundred lashes, and gets banished from his city as a punishment, but if he steals the money purse that belongs to the girl's father from the house, his hand will be cut off. Which will make the father's blood boil, the act of fornication or the loss of his money purse? Fornication

---

involves another human being, while the sin of theft involves property. You can pay back the property, make amends and the matter is finished. But you can't undo the act of fornication; the consequences are harmful and lifelong. Surely the sin of fornication is far greater than stealing even a million dollars. Can these respective punishments be consistent with the God of justice?

Did the just God treat the sin of fornication which can result in life long scars, as a lesser sin than stealing, which could be compensated for by paying back money or property? Did hand cutting come from the just God or did it originate with the "haves" to protect themselves from the "have nots", Could it have originated with the rich who wanted to protect their belongings from the weak and the poor?

## **PAGANISM IS THE REAL SOURCE OF THIS FORM OF PUNISHMENT**

If the commandment to cut off the hand of the person who steals (in a society that provides its basic needs to its citizens) did not have its origin in the Creator, the All-knowing, the Just God, then where did it come from?

Ibn Kathir the Muslim commentator states in his commentary :

---

**"the cutting off of hands as a penalty for theft was practised by the Arabs in the 'days of paganism' (ayyam al-Gahiliyah - the days of ignorance), and was confirmed in Islam with the addition of extra stipulations for it.... It is said that the first to practise the cutting off of the hand was the tribe of Qoraysh in the 'days of paganism'. They cut off the hand of a man called Dawayk who was a chief to the people of Malih b-'Amr from Khasa'ah when he stole a treasure from the Ka'ba." [32]**

**Furthermore, the Encyclopedia of Islam says that this form of punishment (according to the 'Awa'il literature), had already been introduced in the days of paganism by Walid b. Mughirah and that this method of punishment might be of Persian origin. [33]**

It is undisputed then that this form of punishment was practised by the Arabs before the time of Mohammad, namely the days of paganism (ayyam al-gahiliyah), the times of ignorance where people worshipped idols.

## **ABRAHAM NEVER PRACTISED THIS FORM OF PUNISHMENT**

This form of punishment was never practised by Abraham nor his descendants. Evidence of this is found in the Qur'an itself in the story of Joseph. [34] For when one of the

---

brothers of Joseph was accused of stealing Joseph's drinking cup, the cutting off of his hand was never suggested as penalty. When they were asked by the Egyptians: 'What shall be its (that is the crime of stealing the drinking cup) recompense if you are liars?' The children of Jacob stated, in the Qur'an 12:75, how they deal with a thief : 'This shall be its recompense- in whoever's saddle-bag the goblet is found, he shall be its recompense. So we recompense the evil-doers.' They stated how they deal with such a crime when they said 'so we recompense the evil-doers' They suggested the most severe form of retribution which is slavery- he (the thief) shall be its recompense, as they were very sure that they are all innocent of the charge of stealing Joseph's drinking cup. If the cutting off of the hand was known to them they would have said so, just as Mohammad once said "if Fatemah the daughter of Mohammad committed theft. I will cut off her hand"[35]. Al-Galalyn and Razi the Muslim commentators admit that with the children of Israel, slavery as a punishment for theft stood in the place of hand cutting in Islam.[36]

The important point to note is that according to the Qur'an the cutting off of the hand was never practised by Abraham nor his children. So neither Moses nor Jacob nor his grandfather Abraham practised hand cutting as a punishment for theft. For if Abraham practised it Jacob would have done so too. And according to history the cutting



---

off of the hand was practised by the Arabs in the times of ignorance, the times of idol worship, before the time of Mohammad.

The fact that this practice belonged to the pagan times is evident from its condemnation by Amnesty International, which is fighting for human rights world wide:

**"Amnesty International holds amputation to be cruel, inhuman and degrading punishment, and thus prohibited internationally by Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the United Convention against Torture or Other Cruel, Inhuman and Degrading Treatment or Punishment and by the International Convention on Civil and Political Rights.**

In addition, any use of medical skill by physicians to assist in the infliction of any form of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment would clearly be contrary to international codes of medical ethics."[37]

### ***IS HAND CUTTING THE PERFECT SOLUTION ?***

Sayid Qotb, a modern Muslim scholar, has written -

**"the cutting off of the hand as a penalty for stealing is the best foundation upon which the punishment for**

---

**theft is established since the beginning of the world to this day."**[38]

**Does this mean that those idol- worshippers had a regulation dealing with theft, superior to that which God had given Moses? and which was practised by Abraham? Did those pagans (who did not know God) possess this perfect answer to the problem of theft since the beginning of the world? And then, did God give Moses (who worshipped the true God and to whom God spoke directly) an inferior regulation as the answer to the problem of theft, while the pagans who worshipped stones practised the perfect solution for theft, which is hand cutting?**

Did Abraham (who rejected idol worship and worshipped the one true God) and his children receive from God an inferior solution to the problem of theft, while the idol worshippers of Arabia possessed this perfect solution?

Is it possible that God the Creator gave Moses the true and best regulations for dealing with theft? If so, this is the voice to which we must listen. We must listen and adhere to the true voice of God, for it is to Him that we must give account of ourselves.

To ascribe to the perfect God, the barbaric regulations of the pagans is a terrible insult indeed. To take the inhumane and

---

pagan practices of the idol worshippers and make it the will of God is a form of blasphemy. God is far greater and wiser, and fairer than those who devised this savage form of punishment. God is so much higher than the image this form of punishment portrays. If this form of punishment belongs to Allah, then Allah can not be God the creator.

### **OBJECTION**

Does not the Bible speak also of hand cutting? Can the above argument apply to the Bible also?

Yes the Bible does indeed speak of hand cutting. But there is a big difference between the teaching of the Bible and the teaching of the Qur'an. Here is what the Word of God Jesus said:

**"And if your right hand causes you to sin, cut it off and throw it away. It is better for you to lose one part of your body than for your whole body to go into hell."[39]**

**The difference is that Jesus the Christ was not legislating the cutting off of the hand. In other words He never gave one person the right to cut off the hand of another. So you are your own judge and I am my own Judge. The Word of God Jesus was not trying to pass laws to be administered from outside by others. He came to rule from within the**

---

hearts of his followers, and not from outside. The thrust of His words was not the literal application of hand cutting or eye plucking, but that if there is any thing causing us to sin, we must be decisive in removing it from our life, even if it is as precious as our hand or our eye. Also this way of speaking is not unknown to his hearers, for we read in the book of Proverbs:

"When you sit to dine with a ruler, note well what is before you:

And put a knife to your throat, if you are given to gluttony.

Do not crave his delicacies for that food is deceptive."[40]

Of course it does not mean to cut one's throat in this situation. But if that person is that way inclined, he must be extremely careful not to let the stomach influence his decision.

So the Word of God Jesus was not legislating and was not giving a command that the hand should be cut off. The Qur'an, however, was.

---

## THE TEST OF INTERNAL CONSISTENCY

Muslims claim that if the cutting off of the hand as a form of punishment was implemented by any government it would almost eliminate the problem of theft. The Islamic solution to the problem of theft is not that simple, but is full of anomalies as will be seen from the following discussion.

The well verified Hadith provides specific teaching complementary to the Qur'an. It can sometimes even cancel specific teaching of the Qur'an.[41] For example, the Qur'an prescribes a hundred stripes for the sin of fornication (Sura 24:2), but that was abrogated by the Hadith that commands the stoning to death of the married fornicator.

### ***NO HAND CUTTING FOR USURPERS OR EMBEZZLERS***

The Hadith distinguishes between theft (sarika) and usurpation (ghasb - taking by force) and confiscation (khiyana). The punishment of cutting off the hand applies only in the case of theft (sarika) but not in the cases of usurpation (ghasb), that is taking the property of another by force and confiscation (khiyana).

The Hadith states-

**"There is no cutting [of hand] for a confiscator or usurper or embezzler."[42]**

---

**The English translator of Mishkat al- Masabih wrote "There is no cutting of hand ... for criminal misappropriation, nor for theft committed by a marauder or a dacoit "[43]**

***WHAT IS THEFT?***

"The jurists defined theft for which the hadd punishment (cutting the hand) is prescribed as the clandestine removal of legally recognised property (mal) in the safe keeping (hirz) of another ..... to which the thief has no right of ownership; it is so distinguished from usurpation (ghasb) and confiscation (khiyana)"[44] For the Hadd punishment to be applied the property must be removed in a clandestine or secretive way. "For the stipulation of stealth excludes open robbery (nahb) and snatching things unawares (ikhtilas, used of pick-pockets.)[45]

So stealing is the removal of property by stealth, but usurpation (Ghasb), (nahb) and (ikhtilas) are not considered stealing.

The translator of Mishkat Al-Masabih defines ghasb - usurpation - as follows:

**"Ghasb in its literal sense means forcibly taking a thing from another. Technically, it signifies the taking of the property of another without the consent of the owner**

---

in such a manner as to destroy the owner's possession of it."[46]

So Ghasb is not considered stealing in Islam because it is not done secretly. Therefore it is not punishable by the cutting off of the hand. The offender only has to make a restitution of a similar kind according to the Hadith "the hand is under obligation to return that which it took."[47]

The translator of Mishkat Al-Masabih then went on to add -

"By encroachment of the rights of another ... a sin is committed. Forcible possession is an oppression in an extreme form."[48]

Ghasb is not only a worse form of stealing the property of another, but it is the oppression of another. Ghasb is not only a despicable form of property damage, but it is also an ugly form of aggression against people, or to use the words of the translator of Mishkat - an oppression in an extreme form. Ghasb combines stealing and oppression, but the God of Islam did not command the application of the hadd punishment for this flagrant double sin, but prescribed the cutting off of the hand for stealing only!! The God of Islam commands a light punishment for the 'extreme' sin (ghasb), but commands an extreme punishment for the lighter sin

---

sarika)!! Where is the justice? Can such a commandment come from the Judge of the whole earth? God forbid.

### ***NO HAND CUTTING FOR ROBBERY FROM A PUBLIC PLACE***

According to the definition of theft, the stolen property must be classed as Hirz.

**"By hirz is meant guarding by a watchman or by the nature of the place (eg. a private house) Thus theft from a building accessible to the public (eg. shops by day, baths) is not liable to the hadd punishment"[49]**

If a person steals an article from a supermarket or a library, the hadd punishment is not applied to him, because this is not considered stealing in Islam, because a supermarket or a library are public places. But if the same article was stolen from a private place, that is considered stealing. And if a person takes the property of another by force this is not considered stealing, and no Hadd punishment is applicable.

### ***NO HAND CUTTING FOR INCOMPLETE THEFT***

The above inconsistencies are not the only ones. For

**"Only a complete theft is punishable by hadd [hand cutting]. Therefore if, for example, a thief entered a house and took some property, but was caught before taking it out of the house, he cannot be punished by**



---

**hadd ... This is the opinion held by the majority of jurists. According to Abu Hanifah, hadd does not take place if a thief from inside the hirz hands the object to an accomplice outside."**[50]

**So according to Abu Hanifah, who enjoys the largest following of the Muslim world, a person can enter a house, take a TV. for example, hand it to his accomplice from a window, and this man's hand will not be cut off because what he did was an incomplete theft!**

Similarly "if a thief makes a hole in a shop, but left without taking anything, then another came and placed his hand in that hole and took some articles from the shop, no hand cutting can be applied on either men [because the first one did not steal] and the second person did not violate the hirz."[51] For the hole made by the first man rendered the shop as non- hirz. So the second man's action is not considered stealing because he did not take from a hirz.

But "if a person enters a house, takes some articles, and ties them to a dog and he prompts the dog to go outside, his hand will be cut off, but if the dog goes outside by itself with the articles which the thief then retrieves, no hand cutting is applicable."[52]

---

## ***NO HAND CUTTING FOR STEALING A HUMAN BEING***

**"If a person steals a free child [in contrast to a slave child], no hand cutting is applied to him, because a free person is not considered a property." [53]**

**So a person can steal a child without having his hand cut off. But if that child is wearing some jewellery, then the opinions are divided. According to Abu Hanifah, and Shafi'i there is no hand cutting for taking the jewellery, because the jewellery belongs to the free child. But some of the followers of Shafi'i said hand cutting is applicable because the jewellery is a property.**

So in Islam if a person steals a free child (with the exception of the followers of Malik), no hand cutting is applied to him, but if he steals a slave child, his hand must be cut off, because a slave is a property.[54]

So the god of Islam, at least, differentiates between theft (sarika) and usurpation (ghasb), confiscation (khiyana), and embezzlement (ikhtilas), while the God of the Bible treats them equally. In the Bible the LORD said to Moses:

**"If anyone sins and is unfaithful to the LORD by deceiving his neighbour about something entrusted to him or left in his care or stolen, or if he cheats him, or if he finds lost property and lies about it, or if he swears**

---

**falsely, or if he commits any such sin that people may do- when he thus sins and becomes guilty, he must return what he has stolen or taken by extortion, or what was entrusted to him, or the lost property he found, or whatever it was he swore falsely about. He must make restitution in full, add a fifth of the value to it and give it all to the owner on the day he presents his guilt offering."**[55]

**So whether a man steals from his neighbour \$500 - or takes an article by force from his neighbour to the value of \$500 - or confiscates articles to the value of \$500 - or embezzles \$500 from him - or finds a lost article to the value of \$500, and hides it from his neighbour - all are treated as the same sin deserving the same punishment. The act of stealing is no different from the act of embezzlement in the Bible, and is no different from usurpation or confiscation. All amount to an unlawful gain at the expense of one's neighbour and all come from the same self centred, greedy heart, and the end result is the same damage.**

Here are two differing sets of directions. One is from the Qur'an and the Hadith and the other from the Bible. The God of Islam differentiates between theft (sariqa) and usurpation

---

(ghasb), confiscation (khiyana), and embezzlement (ikhtilas). The God of the Bible treats them all as equal.

Which God is consistent in his teachings concerning the damage done to the property of one's neighbour? It is inconsistent to cut the hand of a person who "steals" \$100, while sparing the hand of the one who embezzles the same amount of money. Such inconsistency is unworthy of a human magistrate. How much more is it unworthy of the God of justice.

It is in the Bible that God is honoured as the Just One. To Him be all glory and praise.

If the woman who stole a piece of jewellery in Hadith No.6 took it by force from its owner, she would have kept her hand. But it was not possible. If she was discovered, she would be overpowered by the owner. She is weaker than the owner. This is why stealing is done behind peoples' back. But the act of ghasb is done in defiance of the people's attempts to stop the thief. Ghasb is theft committed by the powerful, while stealing is theft committed by the weak. Whose hand gets cut off? The one who steals in weakness. The God of Islam protects the powerful thief, but cuts off the hand of the weak one! Is this justice? Does God have double standards, or is Allah, the god of Islam not God at all?

---

## ***ALLAH: IS HE THE FORGIVING THE ALL- MERCIFUL***

If one is to survey the Ahadith (plural of Hadith) concerning the punishment for theft, it will be observed that during the life-time of Mohammad every person who was caught stealing had his hand cut off. Not once did Mohammad say to such a person : 'you deserve your hand be cut off. But in the name of Allah, the forgiving, the merciful, the All-compassionate your hand will be spared, make an appropriate restitution, and go unpunished, as a demonstration of the mercy of Allah, go in peace, but do not do it again.' Not once did that happen. But every time a person was caught stealing his hand was cut off, every time a married person was caught committing adultery he was stoned to death. The Hadith even tells us about a woman who came to Mohammad confessing that she is pregnant because of adultery. "Mohammad then called her master and said : 'Treat her well, and when she delivers bring her to me. He did accordingly. Then Allah's Apostle pronounced judgment about her and her clothes were tied around her and then he commanded and she was stoned to death.'"[56]

Compare the above story with a similar incident in the life of Jesus the Word of God.

The Jewish leaders brought to Jesus a woman who was caught in adultery, wanting to stone her according to the Law of Moses. Jesus said to them, ' If any one of you is

---

without sin, let him be the first to throw a stone at her. The people hearing this began to go away one at a time, the older ones first, until only Jesus was left, with the woman still standing there. Jesus asked her, 'Woman, where are they? has any one condemned you?' 'No one, sir,' she said. 'Then neither do I condemn you,' Jesus declared, 'Go now and leave your life of sin.'[57]

The two incidents are very similar, but with a dramatically different outcome. Notice that the woman Jesus did not condemn did not come voluntarily confessing her sin, as the other woman who came to Mohammad. Yet Christ did not condemn her. There are two other incidents about similar women recorded in the life of Jesus, a prostitute who came weeping at the feet of Jesus<sup>58</sup>, and a loose woman who had five husbands whom Jesus deliberately travelled to meet<sup>59</sup>. Jesus forgave both women. It is amazing to note that three women who were implicated in sexual sin were forgiven when confronted by Jesus. While every married person that was caught committing adultery and was brought before Mohammad was stoned to death. The contrast is the difference between life and death. Some might ask why Christ did not order the stoning of the woman who was caught in the act according to the Law of Moses? It is because Christ came to prove that God is not only Just but also merciful in time and space, and in deed and word. Christ came to demonstrate the true God, who has the power not

only to punish according to the Law, but also to forgive because He is the All-compassionate. Even the Qur'an Concur that Christ was a 'mercy from God to mankind.'[60]

#### References:

1. Mishkat al-Masabih, English-Arabic, Book 1, Introduction: Qur'an and Hadith, p.3.
2. Itqan, Vol.II, P.182
3. Mishkat-ul-Masabih, the English translation, Book 1, the importance of the Qur'an and Hadith, P.2,3.
4. Sahih Muslim, Introduction to English translation, P. ii.
5. Mishkat-ul-Masabih, the English translation, Book 1, the importance of the Qur'an and Hadith, P.5, Quoted from Malabudda Minhu, P.8
6. Mishkat-ul-Masabih, the English translation, Book 1, the importance of the Qur'an and Hadith, P.2,3.
7. The Qur'an, 5:38
8. Mishkat-ul-Masabih, Book II, Chapter xxv, Theft, Hadith No. 129. Also mentioned in Abu Daud and Nisai.
9. Mishkat-ul-Masabih, Book II, Section 11, 1210-Theft, Hadith No. 130. Also mentioned in Tirmizi, Abu Daud, Nisai, Ibn Majah.
10. Sahih Muslim, Kitab Al-Hudud, hadith No.4157
11. Sahih Muslim, Kitab Al-Hudud, hadith No.4185
12. Mishkat-ul-Masabih, Book II, Section 11, 1210-Theft, Hadith No. 127. Ibn Majah narrated like it from Abdulla-b-Sufwan and Darimi from Ibn 'Abbas.
13. Tabari, commenting on the Table:38
14. The Encyclopedia of Islam,1934, under section 'SARIK'
15. For Hanafi's and Zaidis the minimum amount is ten dirhams, but among the Malikis, Shafi'is and Shi'is is 1/4 dinar or 3 dirhams. Some reconcile the two figures by making it 1/4 of a dinar.
16. Razi, Attafsir al-Kabir, the Table:38
17. The Bible, Leviticus 6:1-5(NIV).
18. The Bible, Exodus 22:3,4.
19. The Bible, Exodus 22:1.
20. Deuteronomy 15:12-14 (NIV).
21. Dr. Paul Brand, Fearfully and Wonderfully Made, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1981, P. 163.
22. Dr. Paul Brand, Fearfully and Wonderfully Made, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1981, P. 163.
23. Dr. Paul Brand, Fearfully and Wonderfully Made, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1981, P. 132.
- 23a. Creation Ex Nihilo, Vol.12 No. 3, P. 11.
24. Arthur C. Guyton, Anatomy and Physiology, Saunders College Publishing, 1985, p. 327, figure 18-6.
25. Dr. Paul Brand, Fearfully and Wonderfully Made, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1981, P. 163.
26. The Bible, 1 Kings 3:16-28.
27. Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament, edited by James B. Pritchard, Princeton University Press, 1969, the Middle Assyrian Laws, Tablet A: Law 5.
28. Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament, edited by James B. Pritchard, Princeton University Press, 1969, the Code of Hammurabi, Law 253.

29. The Bible, Exodus 21:24.
30. The Encyclopedia of Islam, 1934, under section 'SARIK'.
31. The Qur'an 24:2.
32. Ibn Kathir, commenting on the Table:38.
33. The Encyclopedia of Islam, 1934, under section 'SARIK'.
34. The Qur'an 12:70-81.
35. Sahih Bukhari, Arabic-English translation, vol. 8, Hadith No. 779.
36. Razi, and Al-Galalyn commenting on the Qur'an 12:70-81.
37. Amnesty International, United Kingdom, Medical Letter-Writing Action, Amputations, Muhammad Ahmed al-Hariri, Yemen Arab Republic, 28 March 1989.
38. Sayid Qotb, Fi Zilal al-Qur'an, commenting on the Table:38.
39. The Bible, Matthew 5:30. (NIV)
40. The Bible, Proverbs 23:1-3 (NIV)
41. The Qur'an prescribes a hundred stripes for the sin of fornication (Sura 24:2), that was abrogated by the Hadith that commands the stoning to death of the fornicator if he is a married man.
42. Ibn Magah, Vol.II, Hadith No.2591,2592.
43. Mishkat-ul-Masabih, the English translation, Book 2, Introduction of Chapter xxv section 11 on theft.
44. The Encyclopedia of Islam, 1934, under section 'SARIK'.
45. The Islamic Quarterly, Vol.xxvi (Number 3), Third Quarter, 1982, Offences and Penalties in Islamic Law, p.161.
46. Mishkat-ul-Masabih, English translation, Book II, Chapter XIV on usurpation.
47. Samarqandi, Tuhfat al-Fuqaha, Dar al-Fikr, Damascus, Part three, p. 113.
48. Mishkat-ul-Masabih, English translation, Book II, Chapter XIV on usurpation.
49. The Encyclopedia of Islam, 1934, under section 'SARIK'.
50. The Islamic Quarterly, Vol.xxvi (Number 3), Third Quarter, 1982, Offences and Penalties in Islamic Law, p.161. See also 'Abd ar-Rahman al-Gaziri, al-Fiqh 'ala al-Mazahib al-Arba'a, Dar al-Kutub al-'Elmeyah, 1990, vol. 5, p. 173.
51. 'Abd ar-Rahman al-Gaziri, al-Fiqh 'ala al-Mazahib al-Arba'a, Dar al-Kutub al-'Elmeyah, 1990, vol. 5, p.177.
52. 'Abd ar-Rahman al-Gaziri, al-Fiqh 'ala al-Mazahib al-Arba'a, Dar al-Kutub al-'Elmeyah, 1990, vol. 5, p.173.
53. 'Abd ar-Rahman al-Gaziri, al-Fiqh 'ala al-Mazahib al-Arba'a, Dar al-Kutub al-'Elmeyah, 1990, vol. 5, p.174.
54. 'Abd ar-Rahman al-Gaziri, al-Fiqh 'ala al-Mazahib al-Arba'a, Dar al-Kutub al-'Elmeyah, 1990, vol. 5, p.140.
55. The Bible, Leviticus 6:1-5.
56. Sahih Muslim, English translation, Kitab al-Hudud, Hadith No. 4207
57. The New Testament (N.I.V.), the Gospel of John 7:53-8:11.
58. The Bible, Luke 7:36-50.
59. The Bible, John 4:1-26.
60. The Qur'an 19:21.



---

## Prophet Muhammad's Multiple Marriages

### A Dawagandist Seeks to Defend the Indefensible

[Sam Shamoun](#)

On February 28, 2008 ([YouTube video](#)) Dr. Jamal Badawi addressed the issue of Muhammad's multiple marriages (approximately nine at the time of his death) in light of the Quran restricting Muslims to four wives (Q. 4:3), a number which his prophet clearly exceeded. Badawi came up with some fancy explanations as he sought to deny that Muhammad's polygynous relations were privileges which he allowed to himself:

"Is it really a privilege to the prophet or is it a matter of fairness? Now, you go to the Quran itself and it describes the wives of the prophet as the mothers of believers. In fact, the Quran said it clearly, it is not permissible that anyone would marry the widows of the prophet, which means also 'or divorcees after him.' Why? Because they are in status of mothers of believes, number one. Number two, because they are teacher for future women coming from different tribes, different levels of understanding. And if they get married to some chauvinist person say 'you don't leave home, you don't do that,' you're depriving the Muslim umma from learning Islam as they encountered the prophet on a very close and personal level. Now you tell me, if an

---

ordinary woman married to any Joe Blow, who any person, is divorced because she is wife number five does she have an opportunity to get married? Absolutely! If the prophet divorce any of his wives, and the Quran say it's forbidden that any one would marry them, so if he divorces them in his life what would become of them? Suspended! They are no longer the wives of the prophet but they cannot marry any man again. Is that fair to them or should an exception and accommodation be made for them? Ok."

### **Putting the Cart Before the Horse**

Badawi has proven himself to be a master of logical fallacies with his desperate and erroneous explanations. For example, why should Muhammad's wives be called the mothers of the believers when even he wasn't called their father?

The Prophet is closer to the Believers than their own selves, and his wives are their mothers. Blood-relations among each other have closer personal ties, in the Decree of God. Than (the Brotherhood of) Believers and Muhajirs: nevertheless do ye what is just to your closest friends: such is the writing in the Decree (of God). S. 33:6 Y. Ali

And (remember) when you said to him (Zaid bin Harithah the freedslave of the Prophet) on whom Allah has bestowed Grace (by guiding him to Islam) and you (O Muhammad too)

---

have done favour (by manumitting him) "Keep your wife to yourself, and fear Allah." But you did hide in yourself (i.e. what Allah has already made known to you that He will give her to you in marriage) that which Allah will make manifest, you did fear the people (i.e., Muhammad married the divorced wife of his manumitted slave) whereas Allah had a better right that you should fear Him. So when Zaid had accomplished his desire from her (i.e. divorced her), We gave her to you in marriage, so that (in future) there may be no difficulty to the believers in respect of (the marriage of) the wives of their adopted sons when the latter have no desire to keep them (i.e. they have divorced them). And Allah's Command must be fulfilled. There is no blame on the Prophet in that which Allah has made legal for him. That has been Allah's Way with those who have passed away of (the Prophets of) old. And the Command of Allah is a decree determined. Those who convey the Message of Allah and fear Him, and fear none save Allah. And Sufficient is Allah as a Reckoner. ***Muhammad is not the father of any man among you***, but he is the Messenger of Allah and the last (end) of the Prophets. And Allah is Ever All Aware of everything. S. 33:37-40 Hilali-Khan

Why not call them sisters in faith or simply their fellow believers? Didn't Muhammad himself tell Abu Bakr that even though they were brothers in religion this didn't prevent the former from marrying the latter's daughter Aisha?

---

Narrated

Ursa:

The Prophet asked Abu Bakr for 'Aisha's hand in marriage. Abu Bakr said "***But I am your brother.***" The Prophet said, "You are my brother in Allah's religion and His Book, but she ('Aisha) is lawful for me to marry." (*Sahih al-Bukhari*, Volume 7, Book 62, [Number 18](#))

So why didn't Muhammad follow his own rules here and identify his wives as the believers' sisters in faith, which would give them a chance of remarrying if they so choose?

Furthermore, if we were to take this to its logical conclusion then this means that Muslims would be forbidden from marrying Muhammad's children since they would be considered their siblings. Why did he then permit Ali ibn Abu Talib and Uthman ibn Affan to marry his daughters?

Moreover, why forbid the wives the right to remarry at all when the law of the previous prophets didn't impose such a restriction on the widows of God's true prophets and apostles? In fact, the Holy Bible says that death legitimately dissolves the marital bond and thereby allows the surviving party to remarry:

"Do you not know, brothers—for I am speaking to men who know the law—that the law has authority over a man only as long as he lives? For example, by law a married woman is bound to her husband as long as he is alive, ***but if her***

---

***husband dies, she is released from the law of marriage.*** So then, if she marries another man while her husband is still alive, she is called an adulteress. ***But if her husband dies, she is released from that law*** and is not an adulteress, even though she marries another man." Romans 7:1-3

"A woman is bound to her husband as long as he lives. But if her husband dies, she is free to marry anyone she wishes, but he must belong to the Lord." 1 Corinthians 7:39

Why, then, should Muhammad's god forbid the wives this right and privilege?

Doesn't this make it obvious that Badawi is simply begging the question at this point? Isn't he erroneously assuming that the reason why his prophet kept all of his wives, even though he forced others to only keep four spouses and divorce the rest, is because Muhammad's women wouldn't be able to remarry?

More importantly, if Allah were really merciful then why didn't he simply tell his prophet that wives number five and up were free to remarry after their divorce since Muhammad could only keep four of them? Wouldn't this make much more sense and be more fair and just than to erroneously assume that the reason why Muhammad kept all of them is because they couldn't marry anyone after him if he did set them free?

---

## The Real Occasion Behind this Prohibition

With that said, Badawi conveniently forgot to mention that the real reason why Muhammad didn't allow his wives the right to remarry is because of his extreme jealousy.

According to the expositors the following prohibition,

... And it is not (right) for you that you should annoy Allah's Messenger, nor that you should ever marry his wives after him (his death). Verily! With Allah that shall be an enormity. S. 33:53

Was composed to censure certain Muslims who wanted to marry Muhammad's widows:

... (nor that ye should ever marry his wives after him) after his death. This verse was revealed about Talhah Ibn 'Ubaydullah who had in mind to marry 'A'ishah after the death of the Prophet (pbuh). (Lo! That) your open declaration and intention to marry the Prophet's wives after his death (in Allah's sight would be an enormity) it is an enormous sin which merits severe punishment. (*Tanwîr al-Miqbâs min Tafsîr Ibn 'Abbâs*; [source](#); underline emphasis ours)

And:

---

... This was narrated by Bukhari> Musaddid> Yahya ibn Abi Za'idah> Humayd. Abu Hakim al-Jurjani informed us through verbal authorisation> Abu'l-Faraj al-Qadi> Muhammad ibn Jarir> Ya'qub ibn Ibrahim> Hushaym> Layth> Mujahid who related that the Messenger of Allah, Allah bless him and give him peace, was once eating with his Companions when the hand of one of them touched the hand of 'A'ishah who was with them. The Prophet, Allah bless him and give him peace, was upset because of this, and the verse of segregation was revealed. (... nor that ye should marry his wives after him...) [33:53]. 'Ata' related that Ibn 'Abbas said: "One of the nobles of Quraysh said: 'I would marry 'A'ishah if the Messenger of Allah, Allah bless him and give him peace, were to die', and so Allah, exalted is He, revealed this verse". ('Ali ibn Ahmad al-Wahidi, *Asbab al-Nuzul*; [source](#); underline emphasis ours)

Finally:

### **Prohibition of annoying the Messenger and the Statement that His Wives are Unlawful for the Muslims ...**

*<And it is not (right) for you that you should annoy Allah's Messenger, nor that you should ever marry his wives after him (his death). Verily, with Allah that shall be an enormity.>*  
Ibn Abi Hatim recorded that Ibn 'Abbas said concerning the *Ayah* ...

---

*<And it is not (right) for you that you should annoy Allah's Messenger,>* "This was revealed concerning a man who wanted to marry one of the wives of the Prophet after he died. A man said to Sufyan, 'Was it `A'ishah' He said, 'That is what they said.'" This was also stated by Muqatil bin Hayyan and `Abdur-Rahman bin Zayd bin Aslam. He also reported with his chain of narration from As-Suddi that the one who wanted to do this was Talhah bin `Ubaydullah, may Allah be pleased with him, until this *Ayah* was revealed forbidding that. Hence the scholars were unanimous in stating that it was forbidden for anyone to marry any of the women who were married to the Messenger of Allah at the time when he died, because they are his wives in this world and in the Hereafter, and they are the Mothers of the believers, as stated previously. Allah regarded that as a very serious matter, and issued the sternest of warnings against it, as He said ...

*<Verily, with Allah that shall be an enormity.>* Then He said ...

*<Whether you reveal anything or conceal it, verily, Allah is Ever All-Knower of everything.>* meaning, 'whatever you conceal in your innermost thoughts, it is not hidden from Him at all.' (*Tafsir Ibn Kathir*; [source](#); underline emphasis ours)



---

Doesn't this make it obvious that the reason why Muhammad (or his god as Badawi erroneously believes) disallowed his wives from marrying after him is because he couldn't stand the thought of another man being intimate with them? Aren't these commentaries conclusively demonstrating that Muhammad's wives suffered as a result of their husband's jealousy and insecurities?

For more on this topic we recommend the following article:  
[http://www.answering-ansar.org/answers/private\\_lives/en/chap4.php](http://www.answering-ansar.org/answers/private_lives/en/chap4.php)

### **Were Muhammad's marriages really for peace and unity? Or were they all about lust?**

Badawi further stated that Muhammad didn't really marry because of any inherent lust he had for women. He actually believes that his prophet's marriages essentially served the purpose of conciliating the warring tribes and factions together.

It is obvious that Badawi is using *taqiyya*, or concealment, since this is not what his own so-called authoritative sources say were the reason behind many, if not most, of Muhammad's marriages.

For example, the ahadith unashamedly record that, in the case of the Jewess Juwayriyyah whom Muslims had

---

captured, Muhammad married her because she was stunningly beautiful:

Narrated Aisha, Ummul Mu'minin:

Juwayriyyah, daughter of al-Harith ibn al-Mustaliq, fell to the lot of Thabit ibn Qays ibn Shammās, or to her cousin. She entered into an agreement to purchase her freedom. ***She was a very beautiful woman, most attractive to the eye.***

Aisha said: She then came to the Apostle of Allah (peace\_be\_upon\_him) asking him for the purchase of her freedom. When she was standing at the door, I looked at her with disapproval. ***I realised that the Apostle of Allah (peace\_be\_upon\_him) would look at her in the same way that I had looked.***

She said: Apostle of Allah, I am Juwayriyyah, daughter of al-Harith, and something has happened to me, which is not hidden from you. I have fallen to the lot of Thabit ibn Qays ibn Shammās, and I have entered into an agreement to purchase of my freedom. I have come to you to seek assistance for the purchase of my freedom.

The Apostle of Allah (peace\_be\_upon\_him) said: Are you inclined to that which is better? She asked: What is that, Apostle of Allah? He replied: I shall pay the price of your freedom on your behalf, and I shall marry you.

---

She said: I shall do this. She (Aisha) said: The people then heard that the Apostle of Allah (peace\_be\_upon\_him) had married Juwayriyyah. They released the captives in their possession and set them free, and said: They are the relatives of the Apostle of Allah (peace\_be\_upon\_him) by marriage. We did not see any woman greater than Juwayriyyah who brought blessings to her people. One hundred families of Banu al-Mustaliq were set free on account of her. (*Sunan Abu Dawud*, Book 29, [Number 3920](#))

And:

According to Ibn Humayd–Salamah–Muhammad b. Ishaq – Muhammad b. Ja’far b. al-Zubayr – the Prophet’s wife ‘A’ishah, who said: When the Messenger of God divided the captives of the Banu al-Mustaliq, Juwayriyah bt. Al-Harith fell to the share of Thabit b. Qays b. al-Shammas (or to a cousin of his), and she contracted with him for her freedom. She was a sweet, beautiful woman ***who captivated anyone who looked at her***. She came to the Messenger of God seeking his help in the matter of her contract. By God, as soon as I saw her at the door of my chamber, ***I took a dislike to her, and I knew that he would see in her what I saw...*** (*The History of al-Tabari: The Victory of Islam*, translated by Michael Fishbein [State University of New York Press (SUNY), Albany 1997], Volume VIII (8), pp. 56-57; bold and italic emphasis ours)

---

The translator of al-Tabari writes

... Similar frankness appears in the account in A.H. 6 of Muhammad's marriage to Juwayriyah, "a sweet, beautiful woman, who captivated anyone who looked at her" (the words of 'A'isha's). She had been captured during the raid on the Banu al-Mustaliq and, in accordance with custom, became the slave of one of her captors. The latter agreed to free her in exchange for a sum of money. Juwariyah approached Muhammad for help, and the latter, CAPTIVATED BY HER BEAUTY, offered her "something better" than payment of the price of her freedom – namely, marriage with himself... (Ibid., p. xiii; capital emphasis ours)

Badawi may chime in and say that Muhammad married Juwayriyyah in order to free her. He may further assert that this served as a motivating factor for his followers to set the rest of her tribe free since the Muslims wouldn't want to continue to enslave a people who were now related to their prophet by marriage.

The problem with the above assertions is that Muhammad didn't need to marry her at all since he could have simply paid the ransom and she would have gained her freedom. Better still, Muhammad could have simply commanded the Muslims to set her and her entire tribe free and they would have done exactly as they were told.

---

After all, the Muslims would have no choice but to obey Muhammad's orders since the Quran likens obedience to Islam's prophet to obedience to Allah himself, and even threatens those who disobey Muhammad with severe punishment:

And obey God ***and the Apostle***; that ye may obtain mercy. S. 3:132

Those are limits set by God: those who obey God ***and His Apostle*** will be admitted to Gardens with rivers flowing beneath, to abide therein (for ever) and that will be the supreme achievement. But those who disobey God ***and His Apostle*** and transgress His limits will be admitted to a Fire, to abide therein: And they shall have a humiliating punishment. S. 4:13-14

All who obey God ***and the apostle*** are in the company of those on whom is the Grace of God, - of the prophets (who teach), the sincere (lovers of Truth), the witnesses (who testify), and the Righteous (who do good): Ah! what a beautiful fellowship! S. 4:69

It is not fitting for a Believer, man or woman, ***when a matter has been decided by God and His Apostle to have any option about their decision***: if any one disobeys God and His Apostle, he is indeed on a clearly wrong Path. S. 33:36

---

With this in perspective isn't it obvious once again that the real reason why Muhammad didn't order Thabit ibn Qays ibn Shammās to free Juwayriyyah is because he was too mesmerized by her beauty and wanted her for himself, just as his child bride Aisha noted?

Besides, the reason why she was taken captive in the first place is because Muhammad decided to attack her people! Had Muhammad left well enough alone there would have been no need to ransom Juwayriyyah at all.

She wasn't the only woman whose beauty dazzled Muhammad. The Jewess Safiyya was another young beauty whom Muhammad manumitted in order to marry her:

Narrated	Abdul	Aziz:
Anas said, "When Allah's Apostle invaded Khaibar, we offered the Fajr prayer there (early in the morning) when it was still dark. The Prophet rode and Abu Talha rode too and I was riding behind Abu Talha. The Prophet passed through the lane of Khaibar quickly and my knee was touching the thigh of the Prophet. He uncovered his thigh and I saw the whiteness of the thigh of the Prophet. When he entered the town, he said, 'Allahu Akbar! Khaibar is ruined. Whenever we approach near a (hostile) nation (to fight) then evil will be the morning of those who have been warned.' He repeated this thrice. <b><i>The people came out for their jobs</i></b> and some of them said, 'Muhammad (has come).' (Some of our		

---

companions added, 'With his army.') We conquered Khaibar, took the captives, and the booty was collected. Dihya came and said, 'O Allah's Prophet! Give me a slave girl from the captives.' The Prophet said, 'Go and take any slave girl.' He took Safiya bint Huyai. A man came to the Prophet and said, 'O Allah's Apostle! You gave Safiya bint Huyai to Dihya **and she is the chief mistress of the tribes of Quraiza and An-Nadir and she befits none but you.**' So the Prophet said, **'Bring him along with her.'** So Dihya came with her and when the Prophet saw her, he said to Dihya, **'Take any slave girl other than her from the captives.'**" Anas added: "The Prophet then manumitted her and married her."

And:

Thabit asked Anas, "O Abu Hamza! What did the Prophet pay her (as Mahr)?" He said, "Her self was her Mahr **for he manumitted her and then married her.**" Anas added, "While on the way, Um Sulaim dressed her for marriage (ceremony) and at night she sent her as a bride to the Prophet. So the Prophet was a bridegroom and he said, 'Whoever has anything (food) should bring it.' He spread out a leather sheet (for the food) and some brought dates and others cooking butter. (I think he (Anas) mentioned As-Sawaq). So they prepared a dish of Hais (a kind of meal). And that was Walima (the marriage banquet) of Allah's Apostle." (*Sahih al-Bukhari*, Volume 1, Book 8, [Number 367](#))

---

Finally:

Narrated                      Anas                      bin                      Malik:  
We arrived at Khaibar, and when Allah helped His Apostle to open the fort, ***the beauty of Safiya bint Huyai bin Akhtaq*** whose husband had been killed while she was a bride, ***was mentioned to Allah's Apostle. The Prophet selected her for himself...*** (*Sahih Al-Bukhari*, Volume 5, Book 59, [Number 522](#))

With the foregoing in perspective does it come as a surprise that Muhammad's contemporaries accused him of being a womanizer?

... Layla bt. al-Khatim b. 'Adi b. 'Amr b. Sawad b. Zafar b. al-Harith b. al-Khazraj approached the Prophet while his back was to the sun, and clapped him on his shoulder. He asked who it was, and she replied, "I am the daughter of one who competes with the wind. I am Layla bt. al-Khatim. I have come to offer myself [in marriage] to you, so marry me." He replied, "I accept." She went back to her people and said that the Messenger of God had married her. They said, "What a bad thing you have done! You are a self-respecting woman, **but the Prophet is a womanizer**. Seek an annulment from him." She went back to the Prophet and asked him to revoke the marriage and he complied with [her request]... (*The History of Al-Tabari: The Last Years of the Prophet*, translated and annotated by Ismail K. Poonawala



---

[State University of New York Press, Albany, 1990], Volume IX, p. 139; bold emphasis ours)

And in light of the fact that Muhammad married these Jewish women AFTER he had attacked their tribes and killed their relatives, doesn't this prove that these marriages were clearly not for the purpose of forming peaceful alliances (at least not with those Jewish clans)?

### **Muhammad's Cruelty and Unjust Treatment of his Wives Exposed**

Not only did Muhammad marry women for their beauty, he also divorced women who were too fat and unattractive. For example many people are not aware that the following "revelation:"

And if a woman fears ill usage or desertion on the part of her husband, there is no blame on them, if they effect a reconciliation between them, and reconciliation is better, and avarice has been made to be present in the (people's) minds; and if you do good (to others) and guard (against evil), then surely Allah is aware of what you do. You will not be able to be equitable between your wives, be you ever so eager; yet do not be altogether partial so that you leave her as it were suspended. If you set things right, and are godfearing, God is All-forgiving, All-compassionate. But if

---

they separate, God will enrich each of them of His plenty; God is All-embracing, All-wise. S. 4:128-130

Was composed in relation to Muhammad's attempt of divorcing his wife Sauda solely because he didn't find her attractive. Sauda pleaded with him not to divorce her and worked out a deal where she would hand over the day which Muhammad would normally visit her to Aisha, his favorite wife. Lest we be accused of portraying this in the worst possible light due to our Christian "bias" notice what the following Muslims say concerning this matter:

Muhammad's personal and family life were not always smooth. His wives sometimes bickered amongst themselves and even once engaged in a petty plot against him. A'ishah, for example, disliked her Jewish co-wife, Safiyah, and insulted her periodically. Muhammad had to defend her status and honor a number of times and scold the youthful A'ishah. Hafsa became jealous of her co-wife, Maria, when she found her and Muhammad resting[sic] in her apartment one day. Sawdah gave up her allotted day with the Prophet WHEN SHE REALIZED HE WAS NOT REALLY ATTRACTED TO HER. As for the conspiracy, A'ishah agreed with two other co-wives to convince the Prophet that eating honey made him unpleasant to be around. When Muhammad vowed to never eat honey again, she privately repented to her co-conspirators. Though these incidents were not the norm, they demonstrate that the women in Muhammad's life were as

---

*human as the rest of us.* (Yahiya Emerick, *Critical Lives: Muhammad* [Alpha Books, A Member of Penguin Group (USA) Inc., 2002], p. 263; capital and underline emphasis ours)

And:

Making peace is better than separation. An example of such peace **can be felt in the story of Sawdah bint Zam'ah who WHEN SHE BECAME AGED, THE PROPHET WANTED TO DIVORCE HER, but she made peace with him by offering the night he used to spend with her to A'isha so that he would keep her.** The Prophet accepted such terms and kept her.

Abu Dawud At-Tayalisi recorded that Ibn 'Abbas said, "Sawdah feared that the Messenger of Allah might divorce her and she said, 'O Messenger of Allah! Do not divorce me; give my day to 'A'ishah.' And he did ...

In the Two *Sahih*s, it is recorded that 'A'ishah said **that when Sawdah bint Zam'ah BECAME OLD, she forfeited her day to 'A'ishah and the Prophet used to spend Sawdah's night with 'A'ishah ...**

*<And making peace is better>.* **IT REFERS TO THE WIFE RELINQUISHING SOME OF HER MARITAL RIGHTS and his acceptance of the offer. Such compromise is better than total divorce, as the Prophet did when retained Sawdah bint Zam'ah. By doing so, the Prophet set an example for**

---

**his Ummah to follow as it is a lawful act** ... (the preceding citation taken and adapted from *Tafsir Ibn Kathir - Abridged, Volume 2, Parts 3, 4 & 5, Surat Al-Baqarah, Verse 253, to Surat An-Nisa, Verse 147* [Darussalam Publishers & Distributors, Riyadh, Houston, New York, Lahore; first edition March 2000], pp. 599-601, and *Tafsir Ibn Kathir, Part 5, Sura An-Nisa, ayat 24-147*, abridged by Sheikh Muhammad Nasib Ar-Rafa'i [Al-Firdous Ltd., London, 2000 first edition], pp. 193-194; bold and capital emphasis ours)

Finally:

When 'Aishah taunted her over her age, she feared that she could be divorced by the Prophet. But her desire was to be raised as the Prophet's wife on the Day of Judgement. So she gifted away her day to 'Aishah<sup>6</sup> It is said that the Verse 128 of An-Nisa' was revealed in reference to her. It said, ...

*"And if a woman fears from her husband either cruelty or desertion, then, there is no sin on the two that they should make peace between themselves, and peace is better."*<sup>7, 8</sup>

She was a heavy woman, of slow movements. Once she said to the Prophet, "Last night I prayed behind you, but while bowing down I held my nose from the fear of the blood drops." (That is because the Prophet's bowing and prostration were severely long). The Prophet smiled at her. And because of her weight and old age, the Prophet allowed

---

her and others of her kind to leave Muzdalifah at *Hajj* at night before others could do.

6 *Al-Bukhari/Al-Fath* (19/273/H. 5212), *Muslim* (2/1085/H. 1463), *Abu Dawud* (2/602/The Book of *Nikah*/H. 2135), Ahmad: *Al-Fathur-Rabbani* (22/108) and (16/239): *Sahih Ibn Majah* (1/334/H. 1972) WHERE ALBANI SAID IT IS SAHIH.

7 *Surat An-Nisa'*: 128.

8 See Tabari: *Tafsir* (9/276-278) through a Sound (*Sahih*) chain, *Abu Dawud* (2/602/The Book of Marriage/H. 2135) and Albani: *Sahih At-Tirmidhi* (3/The Book of *Tafsir*/H. 2434), where Tirmidhi said that this has A HASAN-SAHIH (GOOD & SOUND) CHAIN WHICH WAS ALSO THE OPINION OF ALBANI. (*A Biography of the Prophet of Islam In the Light of Original Sources: An Analytical Study*, by Dr. Mahdi Rizqullah Ahmad, translated by Syed Iqbal Zaheer [Darussalam Publishers and Distributors, Riyadh, Jeddah, Sharjah, Lahore, London, Houston, New York; First Edition: November 2005], Volume 2, Chapter 29: The Mothers of the Believers, pp. 866-867; bold, capital and underline emphasis ours)

The so-called sound reports further say that Sauda was a fat woman:

Narrated

Aisha:

Sauda (the wife of the Prophet) went out to answer the call of nature after it was made obligatory (for all the Muslims

---

ladies) to observe the veil. **She was a fat huge lady**, and everybody who knew her before could recognize her. So 'Umar bin Al-Khattab saw her and said, "O Sauda! By Allah, you cannot hide yourself from us, so think of a way by which you should not be recognized on going out. Sauda returned while Allah's Apostle was in my house taking his supper and a bone covered with meat was in his hand. She entered and said, "O Allah's Apostle! I went out to answer the call of nature and 'Umar said to me so-and-so." Then Allah inspired him (the Prophet) and when the state of inspiration was over and the bone was still in his hand as he had not put it down, he said (to Sauda), "You (women) have been allowed to go out for your needs." (*Sahih Al-Bukhari*, Volume 6, Book 60, [Number 318](#))

With the foregoing in the background it is apparent that Muhammad decided to abandon Sauda because he no longer felt any attraction to her due to the fact that she was too old and fat. Muhammad even came up with a command to justify neglecting and mistreating any wife which he no longer desired. Yet by coming up with such a "revelation" Muhammad ended up granting all men the right to simply ignore any wife that they feel is unattractive, giving them "divine" license to deny any of their spouses the pleasure of love and intimacy!

In light of all of this, doesn't Sauda's example provide further substantiation that most, if not all, of Muhammad's

---

marriages were done out of selfish motives and/or for lustful desires?

As if this weren't shameful enough, Muhammad further justified his willful neglect of his wives and preferential treatment of Aisha by claiming that the so-called divine revelations only came down to him when he was in her clothes and bed!

Narrated 'Urwa from 'Aisha: **The wives of Allah's Apostle were in two groups.** One group consisted of 'Aisha, Hafsa, Safiyya and Sauda; and the other group consisted of Um Salama and the other wives of Allah's Apostle. **The Muslims knew that Allah's Apostle loved 'Aisha, so if any of them had a gift and wished to give to Allah's Apostle, he would delay it, till Allah's Apostle had come to 'Aisha's home and then he would send his gift to Allah's Apostle in her home.** The group of Um Salama discussed the matter together and decided that Um Salama should request Allah's Apostle to tell the people to send their gifts to him in whatever wife's house he was. Um Salama told Allah's Apostle of what they had said, but he did not reply. Then they (those wives) asked Um Salama about it. She said, "He did not say anything to me." They asked her to talk to him again. She talked to him again when she met him on her day, but he gave no reply. When they asked her, she replied that he had given no reply. They said to her, "Talk to him till he gives you a reply." When it was her turn,



---

she talked to him again. He then said to her, "Do not hurt me regarding Aisha, **AS THE DIVINE INSPIRATIONS DO NOT COME TO ME ON ANY OF THE BEDS EXCEPT THAT OF AISHA.**" On that Um Salama said, "I repent to Allah for hurting you." Then the group of Um Salama called Fatima, the daughter of Allah's Apostle and sent her to Allah's Apostle to say to him, "**Your wives request to treat them and the daughter of Abu Bakr ON EQUAL TERMS.**" Then Fatima conveyed the message to him. The Prophet said, "O my daughter! **Don't you love whom I love?**" She replied in the affirmative and returned and told them of the situation. They requested her to go to him again but she refused. They then sent Zainab bint Jahsh who went to him **AND USED HARSH WORDS SAYING, "Your wives request you TO TREAT THEM and the daughter of Ibn Abu Quhafa ON EQUAL TERMS."** On that she raised her voice **AND ABUSED 'Aisha TO HER FACE** so much so that Allah's Apostle looked at 'Aisha to see whether she would retort. 'Aisha started replying to Zainab till she silenced her. The Prophet then looked at 'Aisha and said, "She is really the daughter of Abu Bakr." (*Sahih al-Bukhari*, Volume 3, Book 47, [Number 755](#))

The wives demanded equal time and attention and how does Muhammad respond? Does he make an effort to correct his blatant mistreatment of his spouses? No, instead of doing the right thing he unashamedly asserts that his deity only gives him divine revelations when he is in bed



---

with Aisha! Imagine that, Muhammad blames his god for discriminating against his spouses!

With this in view does it come as a surprise that even his child bride Aisha noticed how Muhammad's deity often came running to gratify his messenger's desires?

Narrated

Aisha:

I used to look down upon those ladies who had given themselves to Allah's Apostle and I used to say, "Can a lady give herself (to a man)?" But when Allah revealed: "You (O Muhammad) can postpone (the turn of) whom you will of them (your wives), and you may receive any of them whom you will; and there is no blame on you if you invite one whose turn you have set aside (temporarily)." (33.51) I said (to the Prophet), **"I feel that your Lord hastens in fulfilling your wishes and desires."** (*Sahih al-Bukhari*, Volume 6, Book 60, [Number 311](#))

And doesn't this further prove that Muhammad had no shame and did not hesitate to blame everything on his deity? And yet this is the same man that Badawi wants to foist upon the world as a mercy and a prophet!

**Where is the Mercy?**

---

Badawi also ignored or forgot to mention that Muhammad placed his wives under a sort of house arrest, commanding that they stay locked up in their homes:

O wives of the Prophet! you are not like any other of the women; If you will be on your guard, then be not soft in (your) speech, lest he in whose heart is a disease yearn; and speak a good word. *AND STAY IN YOUR HOUSES* and do not display your finery like the displaying of the ignorance of yore; and keep up prayer, and pay the poor-rate, and obey Allah and His Apostle. Allah only desires to keep away the uncleanness from you, O people of the House! and to purify you a (thorough) purifying. S. 33:32-33 Shakir

Here are the comments of Ibn Kathir which help to put this in perspective:

*<And stay in your houses,>* means, stay in your houses and do not come out except for a purpose. One of the purposes mentioned in Shari`ah is prayer in the Masjid, so long as the conditions are fulfilled, as the Messenger of Allah said...

*<Do not prevent the female servants of Allah from the Masjids of Allah, but have them go out without wearing fragrance.>* According to another report...

*<even though their houses are better for them.>* ([Source](#))

---

What commands such as the above and Q. 33:53 indicate is that wives such as Aisha and Safiyyah could never again marry another person once Muhammad died and had to stay locked up in their homes.

What makes this so tragic is that these women were young when they became widows, in the case of Aisha she was nine when she got married and only eighteen when her husband died:

Narrated 'Aisha:  
that the Prophet married her when she was six years old **and he consummated his marriage when she was nine years old**, and then she remained with him for nine years (i.e., till his death). (*Sahih al-Bukhari*, Volume 7, Book 62, [Number 64](#); see also Numbers 65 and 88)

Safiyyah was seventeen when Muhammad took her for a spouse and roughly twenty when he died. Both Aisha and Safiyya eventually died in their sixties:

According to Muhammad b. Musa – 'Umarah b. al-Muhajir – Aminah bt. Abi Qays al-Ghifariyyah: I was one of the women who led Safiyyah as a bride to the Prophet. I heard her say: **I was not even seventeen, or I was just seventeen, the night I entered the Prophet's [room].**

Safiyyah died in the year 52/January 8, 672–December 26, 672, during the caliphate of Mu'awiyah, and was buried in

---

al-Baqi'. (*The History of al-Tabari: Biographies of the Prophet's Companions and Their Successors*, Volume XXXIX (39), p. 185; bold and underline emphasis ours)

Aisha herself died in the year 678 AD., at the approximate age of 66:

'A'isha died in Ramadan 58/June-July 678...

According to Muhammad b. 'Umar [al-Waqidi]: 'A'ishah died on Tuesday night, the 17<sup>th</sup> of Ramadan 58/July 13, 678, and was buried the same night after the night prayer. She was then sixty-six years old. (*The History of Al-Tabari*, Volume XXXIX, p. 173)

The foregoing indicates that wives such as Aisha and Safiyyah remained locked up in their homes as childless widows for years, in some instances for more than forty years! Far from being an act of mercy this was one of the worst curses a young maiden could ever experience in her life. To think that these women never had the joy of raising children or of having husbands to comfort and meet all of their needs for the rest of their lives is truly heart wrenching to say the least.

And yet this is the man that Badawi wants to pass off as a true prophet of God and mercy unto mankind!

---

We say to Badawi, you can keep Muhammad. We will take the Lord Jesus, God's beloved and eternal Son, over him any time:

"Come to me, all you who are weary and burdened, ***and I will give you rest.*** Take my yoke upon you and learn from me, for I am gentle and humble in heart, ***and you will find rest for your souls.*** For my yoke is easy and my burden is light." Matthew 11:28-30

"Peace I leave with you; ***my peace I give you.*** I do not give to you as the world gives. Do not let your hearts be troubled and do not be afraid." John 14:27

"I have told you these things, ***so that in me you may have peace.*** In this world you will have trouble. But take heart! ***I have overcome the world.***" John 16:33

"Therefore, remember that formerly you who are Gentiles by birth and called 'uncircumcised' by those who call themselves 'the circumcision' (that done in the body by the hands of men)— remember that at that time you were separate from Christ, excluded from citizenship in Israel and foreigners to the covenants of the promise, without hope and without God in the world. ***But now in Christ Jesus you who once were far away have been brought near through the blood of Christ. For he himself is our peace,*** who has made the two one and has destroyed the barrier, the

---

dividing wall of hostility, by abolishing in his flesh the law with its commandments and regulations. His purpose was to create in himself one new man out of the two, ***thus making peace, and in this one body to reconcile both of them to God through the cross, by which he put to death their hostility***. He came and preached peace to you who were far away and peace to those who were near. For ***through him*** we both have access to the Father by one Spirit." Ephesians 2:11-18

"Therefore, rid yourselves of all malice and all deceit, hypocrisy, envy, and slander of every kind. Like newborn babies, crave pure spiritual milk, so that by it you may grow up in your salvation, ***now that you have tasted that the Lord is good***. As you come to him, the living Stone—rejected by men but chosen by God and precious to him— you also, like living stones, are being built into a spiritual house to be a holy priesthood, offering spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God ***through Jesus Christ***." 1 Peter 2:1-5

Continue with [Part 2](#).

### Recommended Reading

<http://answering-islam.org/Shamoun/prepubescent.htm>  
[http://answering-islam.org/Shamoun/treatment\\_of\\_wives.htm](http://answering-islam.org/Shamoun/treatment_of_wives.htm)  
<http://answering-islam.org/Shamoun/sauda.htm>  
<http://answering-islam.org/Authors/Newton/sauda.html>  
[http://answering-islam.org/Responses/Osama/zawadi\\_cruelty.htm](http://answering-islam.org/Responses/Osama/zawadi_cruelty.htm)  
[http://answering-islam.org/Responses/Osama/zawadi\\_safiyyah.htm](http://answering-islam.org/Responses/Osama/zawadi_safiyyah.htm)  
[http://answering-islam.org/Responses/Osama/zawadi\\_safiyyah2.htm](http://answering-islam.org/Responses/Osama/zawadi_safiyyah2.htm)  
[http://answering-islam.org/Responses/Osama/zawadi\\_barra.htm](http://answering-islam.org/Responses/Osama/zawadi_barra.htm)  
[http://answering-islam.org/Responses/Osama/zawadi\\_mhd\\_wives\\_challenge.htm](http://answering-islam.org/Responses/Osama/zawadi_mhd_wives_challenge.htm)

---

[http://answering-islam.org/Responses/Osama/zawadi\\_mhd\\_wives\\_challenge2.htm](http://answering-islam.org/Responses/Osama/zawadi_mhd_wives_challenge2.htm)  
<http://answering-islam.org/Silas/kinana.htm>  
<http://answering-islam.org/Gilchrist/Vol1/2c.html>  
[http://answering-islam.org/Muhammad/Inconsistent/idda\\_safiyyah.html](http://answering-islam.org/Muhammad/Inconsistent/idda_safiyyah.html)  
<http://faithfreedom.org/Articles/sina/safiyyah.htm>

